arXiv:1302.3707v1 [hep-th] 15 Feb 2013

UWThPh-2013-04
CCNY-HEP-13/2

# Brane compactifications and 4-dimensional geometry in the IKKT model

Alexios Polychronakos*,[1], Harold Steinacker†,[2], Jochen Zahn†,[3]

* *Physics Department*
*The City College of the CUNY*
*160 Convent Avenue, New York, NY 10031, USA*

† *Faculty of Physics, University of Vienna*
*Boltzmanngasse 5, A-1090 Vienna, Austria*

## Abstract

We study in detail certain brane solutions with compact extra dimensions $M^4 \times \mathcal{K}$ in the IKKT matrix model, with $\mathcal{K}$ being a two-dimensional rotating torus embedded in $\mathbb{R}^6$. We focus on the compactification moduli and the fluctuations of $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^6$ and their physical significance. Mediated by the Poisson tensor, they contribute to the effective 4-dimensional metric on the brane, and thereby become gravitational degrees of freedom. We show that the zero modes corresponding to the global symmetries of the model lead to Ricci-flat 4-dimensional metric perturbations, wherever the energy-momentum tensor vanishes. Their coupling to the energy momentum tensor depends on the extrinsic curvature of the brane.

---

[1] alexios@sci.ccny.cuny.edu
[2] harold.steinacker@univie.ac.at
[3] jochen.zahn@univie.ac.at

# Contents

1 Introduction 2

2 Matrix models and their geometry 4
- 2.1 Noncommutative branes and their geometry . . . 5

3 Compactified brane solutions and their geometry 6
- 3.1 The embedded fuzzy torus . . . 7
- 3.2 Compactification with rotating fuzzy tori . . . 8
- 3.3 Semi-classical equations of motion . . . 10
- 3.4 Currents and conservation laws . . . 13
- 3.5 Flux stabilization . . . 14

4 Gauge theory interpretation 15
- 4.1 Translational invariance and periodicity . . . 16
- 4.2 Kaluza-Klein modes . . . 17

5 Geometry, perturbations and curvature 18
- 5.1 Perturbations and coupling to matter . . . 18
- 5.2 Zero modes and and low-energy effective action . . . 19
- 5.3 Linearized curvature tensor . . . 23
- 5.4 Perturbations and equations of motion . . . 25

6 Conclusions and outlook 26

A Conserved currents 27
- A.1 The general setup . . . 27
- A.2 The Lorentz current . . . 28
- A.3 The energy-momentum tensor . . . 29

B Explicit examples. 29
- B.1 Type A solutions. . . . 29
- B.2 Type B solutions. . . . 30
- B.3 Type C solutions. . . . 31

C Equations of motion at the operator level 32

# 1 Introduction

Matrix models of Yang-Mills type are very interesting candidates for a theory of fundamental interactions including gravity. In particular, the so-called IKKT or IIB matrix model [1] is singled out by maximal supersymmetry, and thus has a good chance to provide a well-defined quantum theory. The basic observation is that these models admit noncommutative or quantized submanifold ("branes") as solutions. This leads to a relation with string theory and supergravity, and the model has been proposed as a non-perturbative definition of string theory; cf. [2–5] for some basic references. Here we follow the idea that suitable brane solutions could play the role of physical space-time. Indeed, fluctuations around such solutions give rise to noncommutative gauge theory living on the brane, governed by a universal effective metric. This dynamical metric absorbs the $U(1)$ degrees of freedom of the gauge theory [6], and plays the role of a gravitational metric. Such an "emergent" gravity scenario is supported by several observations including gauge transformations giving rise to symplectomorphisms, (tangential) would-be $U(1)$ modes leading to Ricci-flat vacuum perturbations [7], and other related observations [8–11]. However, it remains to be shown that the full Einstein equations emerge in a suitable regime.

In order to model realistic physics, basic branes such as $\mathbb{R}^4 \subset \mathbb{R}^{10}$ are clearly too simple. One way to introduce additional structure as required for particle physics is to consider compactified extra dimensions. In this paper, we discuss some specific new solutions of the IKKT model with compactified extra dimensions $M^4 \times \mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{10}$. These solutions behave for low energies as flat 4-dimensional spaces with Minkowski signature. The extra $\mathcal{K}$ arises from a fuzzy torus $T^2_N$ embedded in the 6 transversal dimensions of the model, which is stabilized by angular momentum and (generically non-vanishing) flux. This generalizes solutions found previously for the IKKT model [12] as well as the BFSS model, e.g. [13], [14].

Besides elaborating structural aspects of the solutions, we focus on the effective 4-dimensional metric which governs the lowest Kaluza-Klein (KK) modes on the brane, and plays the role of a gravitational metric. As pointed out in [10], the moduli of the extra dimensions directly affect the effective 4-dimensional metric, due to the noncommutative structure. Our aim is to understand these metric contributions due to the extra dimensions, and to clarify the effective gravitational dynamics resulting from the matrix model action.

As a consequence of the global $SO(9,1)$ symmetry of the matrix model, the embedding of the compact space $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^6$ in the transversal directions leads to massless zero modes, which are nothing but Goldstone bosons from the 4-dimensional point of view. These zero modes are expected to play a central role in the low-energy or long-distance physics on the brane. We therefore focus on the dynamics of these zero modes, and clarify their contribution to the 4-dimensional curvature perturbations. It turns out that they lead indeed to Ricci-flat metric perturbations at locations without matter $T_{\mu\nu} = 0$, provided the compactification has non-vanishing flux. The latter condition is imposed in order to stabilize the radial modes. However due to this radial stabilization, matter acts as a source for the 4-dimensional Ricci tensor only via derivative terms $\partial T_{\mu\nu}$, similar to the contributions from the would-be $U(1)$ gauge fields [6, 7]. This complements and contrasts the results in [10] for the case of massless radial modes, where a non-derivative coupling to $T_{\mu\nu}$ and hence a non-vanishing Newton constant was found. That however entails mixing between radial and tangential degrees of freedom, which obscured the analysis leading to inconclusive results. For the present backgrounds, we conclude that the dynamics of the geometry is compatible with the vacuum sector of gravity, however the appropriate coupling to matter requires a different mechanism which is not seen in the present analysis. Such a coupling might arise in various ways on branes with extrinsic curvature [9–11], which will be pursued elsewhere.

The approach to matrix models pursued here is rather different from much of the work in the literature, which is focused on the bulk sector rather than the brane geometry itself. In the 10-dimensional bulk, the geometry arises in a holographic manner, and is related to supergravity. To make contact with 4-dimensional physics, the bulk must then be compactified [15, 16]. However this is implemented via a somewhat ad-hoc constraint on all degrees of freedom in the matrix model, and moreover any such 10-dimensional background is perturbatively un-stable [1]. In contrast, the present approach based on lower-dimensional solutions of the basic matrix model has a good chance to be perturbatively finite, and might also dispense with the need for 10-dimensional compactifications if the effective 4-dimensional gravity on the brane turns out to be physically viable. This is the main motivation for the present approach.

It is also interesting to consider the same type of backgrounds from the point of view of 4-dimensional non-commutative gauge theory. We point out that they correspond to certain time-dependent solutions which are periodic rather than translation invariant. In particular, analogous solutions should also exist for conventional $\mathcal{N} = 4$ super-Yang-Mills theory, realized by time-dependent non-trivial VEVs of the 6 scalar fields. However, in the absence of noncommutativity the $U(1)$ sector would decouple, and the effective 4-dimensional geometry would not be affected by the compactification (i.e. the scalar fields). On the other hand, a similar effect is expected to arise on branes with flux embedded in $\mathbb{R}^{10}$ governed by the Dirac-Born-Infeld action.

This paper is organized as follows. After recalling some background we present the basic structure of the solutions under consideration in section 3, focusing on three classes of solutions characterized by non-vanishing currents. Their semi-classical significance is elaborated. We then explain the 4-dimensional gauge theory interpretation of the backgrounds in section 4. In section 5 we study the zero modes of the embedding fluctuations of $\mathcal{K}$, elaborate their effective action, and determine the resulting perturbations of the Ricci tensor. The full equations of motion for perturbations is given in section 5.4, Finally the appendices provide explicit details for the solutions under consideration as well as a general discussion of conserved currents in the matrix model.

## 2 Matrix models and their geometry

We briefly collect the essential ingredients of the matrix model framework and its effective geometry, referring to the recent review [6] for more details.

The starting point is given by a matrix model of Yang-Mills type,

$$S_{\rm YM} = \frac{1}{4}{\rm Tr}\left([X^A,X^B][X^C,X^D]\eta_{AC}\eta_{BD} + 2\overline{\Psi}\gamma_A[X^A,\Psi]\right) \tag{2.1}$$

where the $X^A$ are Hermitian matrices, i.e. operators acting on a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. The indices of the matrices run from 0 to $D-1$, and will be raised or lowered with the invariant tensor $\eta_{AB}$ of $SO(D-1,1)$. Although this paper is mostly concerned with the bosonic sector, we focus on the maximally supersymmetric IKKT or IIB model [1] with $D = 10$, which is best suited for quantization. Then $\Psi$ is a matrix-valued Majorana Weyl spinor of $SO(9,1)$. The model enjoys the fundamental gauge symmetry

$$X^A \to U^{-1}X^AU\,, \qquad \Psi \to U^{-1}\Psi U\,, \qquad U \in U(\mathcal{H}) \tag{2.2}$$

as well as the 10-dimensional Poincaré symmetry

$$\begin{aligned} &X^A \to \Lambda(g)^A_B X^b\,, \qquad &&\Psi_\alpha \to \tilde\pi(g)^\beta_\alpha\Psi_\beta\,, \qquad &&g \in \widetilde{SO}(9,1), \\ &X^A \to X^A + c^A\mathbb{1}\,, && &&c^A \in \mathbb{R}^{10} \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

and a $\mathcal{N}=2$ matrix supersymmetry [1]. The tilde indicates the corresponding spin group. We define the matrix Laplacian as

$$\Box\Phi := [X_B,[X^B,\Phi]] \tag{2.4}$$

for any matrix $\Phi\in\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Then the equations of motion of the model take the following form

$$\Box X^A \;=\; [X_B,[X^B,X^A]] = 0 \tag{2.5}$$

for all $A$, assuming $\Psi = 0$.

## 2.1 Noncommutative branes and their geometry

Now we focus on matrix configurations which describe embedded noncommutative (NC) branes. This means that the $X^A$ can be interpreted as quantized embedding functions [6]

$$X^A \sim x^A: \quad \mathcal{M}^{2n}\hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{10} \tag{2.6}$$

of a $2n$- dimensional submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{10}$. More precisely, there should be some quantization map $\mathcal{Q}:\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})\to\mathcal{A}\subset L(\mathcal{H})$ which maps classical functions on $\mathcal{M}$ to a noncommutative (matrix) algebra of functions, such that commutators can be interpreted as quantized Poisson brackets. In the semi-classical limit indicated by $\sim$, matrices are identified with functions via $\mathcal{Q}$, in particular, $X^A=\mathcal{Q}(x^A)\sim x^A$, and commutators are replaced by Poisson brackets. For a more extensive introduction see e.g. [6]. Then the commutators

$$[X^A,X^A] \;\sim\; i\{x^A,x^A\} \;=\; i\theta^{ab}(x)\partial_a x^A\partial_b x^B \tag{2.7}$$

encode a quantized Poisson structure on $(\mathcal{M}^{2n},\theta^{ab})$. This Posson structure sets a typical scale of noncommutativity $\Lambda_{\mathrm{NC}}$. We will assume that $\theta^{ab}$ is non-degenerate[4], so that the inverse matrix $\theta^{-1}_{ab}$ defines a symplectic form on $\mathcal{M}^{2n}\subset\mathbb{R}^{10}$. This submanifold is equipped with the induced metric

$$g_{ab}(x) = \partial_a x^A\partial_b x_A \tag{2.8}$$

which is the pull-back of $\eta_{AB}$. However, this is *not* the effective metric on $\mathcal{M}$. To understand the effective metric and gravity, we need to consider matter on the brane $\mathcal{M}$. Bosonic matter or fields arise from nonabelian fluctuations of the matrices around a stack $X^A\otimes\mathbb{1}_k$ of coinciding branes, while fermionic matter arises from $\Psi$ in (2.1). It turns out that in the semi-classical limit, the effective action for such fields is governed by a universal effective metric $G^{ab}$. It can be obtained most easily by considering the action of an additional scalar field $\phi$ coupled to the matrix model in a gauge-invariant way, with action

$$\begin{aligned} S[\phi] = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\,[X_A,\phi][X^A,\phi] &\sim -\frac{1}{2(2\pi)^n}\int d^{2n}x\sqrt{|\theta^{-1}|}\theta^{aa'}\theta^{bb'}g_{a'b'}\,\partial_a\phi\partial_b\phi \\ &= -\frac{1}{2(2\pi)^n}\int d^{2n}x\sqrt{|G|}\,G^{ab}\partial_a\phi\partial_b\phi. \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

---

[4] If the Poisson structure is degenerate, then the fluctuations propagate only along the symplectic leaves.

Therefore the effective metric is given by [17]

$$
\begin{aligned}
G^{ab} &= e^{-\sigma}\theta^{aa'}\theta^{bb'}g_{a'b'}\,, \\
e^{-\sigma} &= \Big(\frac{\det\theta^{-1}_{ab}}{\det G_{ab}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \Big(\frac{\det\theta^{-1}_{ab}}{\det g_{ab}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2(n-1)}}
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.10}
$$

for $n > 1$. To understand the dynamics of the geometry in more detail, the following result is useful [6]: the matrix Laplace operator reduces in the semi-classical limit to the covariant Laplace operator[5]

$$
\Box\Phi = [X_A,[X^A,\Phi]] \;\sim\; -e^{\sigma}\Box_G\,\phi \tag{2.11}
$$

acting on scalar fields $\Phi \sim \phi$. In particular, the matrix equations of motion (2.5) take the simple form

$$
0 = \Box X^A \;\sim\; -e^{\sigma}\Box_G x^A. \tag{2.12}
$$

This means that the embedding functions $x^A \sim X^A$ are harmonic functions with respect to $G$. Furthermore, the bosonic matrix model action (2.1) can be written in the semi-classical limit as follows

$$
S_{\rm YM} \;\sim\; -\frac{1}{4(2\pi)^{2n}}\int d^{2n}x\sqrt{|\theta^{-1}|}\,\gamma^{ab}g_{ab}. \tag{2.13}
$$

Here we introduce the conformally equivalent metric[6]

$$
\gamma^{ab} = \theta^{aa'}\theta^{bb'}g_{a'b'} \;=\; e^{\sigma}\,G^{ab} \tag{2.14}
$$

which satisfies

$$
\sqrt{|\theta^{-1}|}\gamma^{ab} = \sqrt{|G|}\,G^{ab}. \tag{2.15}
$$

# 3 Compactified brane solutions and their geometry

Now we discuss in more detail branes with compactified extra dimensions

$$
\mathcal{M}^{2n} = \mathcal{M}^4 \times \mathcal{K} \quad\subset\; \mathbb{R}^D \tag{3.1}
$$

where the extrinsic curvature is predominantly due to $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^D$, while the embedding of $\mathcal{M}^4$ is approximately flat. Such solutions including $\mathcal{K} = T^2$ and $\mathcal{K} = S^3 \times S^1$ have been given recently [12], where $\mathcal{K}$ is rotating along $\mathcal{M}^4$ and stabilized by angular momentum. $\Box_G x^A = 0$ is possible because of "split" or mixed noncommutativity, where the Poisson structure relates the compact space $\mathcal{M}^4$ with the non-compact space $\mathcal{K}$,

$$
\{x^\mu, x^i\} \neq 0\;. \tag{3.2}
$$

Here $x^\mu$ are coordinates on $\mathcal{M}^4$ and $x^i$ are the embedding functions of $\mathcal{K}$. This implies that perturbations of $\mathcal{K}$ lead to perturbations of the effective 4-dimensional metric on $\mathcal{M}^4$, as elaborated below.

---

[5] This result does not apply to the 2-dimensional case, where a modified formula holds [18].

[6] More abstractly, this can be stated as $(\alpha,\beta)_\gamma = (i_\alpha\theta, i_\beta\theta)_g$ where $\theta = \frac{1}{2}\theta^{ab}\partial_a\wedge\partial_b$.

## 3.1 The embedded fuzzy torus

Starting with the unitary clock and shift matrices $U, V$ with $UV = qVU$ and $U^N = V^N = 1$ for $q = e^{2\pi i/N}$, we can define 3 complex matrices

$$\tilde{Z}^i = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{X}^4 + i\tilde{X}^5 \\ \tilde{X}^6 + i\tilde{X}^7 \\ \tilde{X}^8 + i\tilde{X}^9 \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.3}$$

where

$$\tilde{X}^4 + i\tilde{X}^5 = U, \qquad \tilde{X}^6 + i\tilde{X}^7 = V, \qquad \tilde{X}^8 = \tilde{X}^9 = 0\ . \tag{3.4}$$

This defines a fuzzy torus $T^2_N$ embedded in $\mathbb{R}^6$. They satisfy the relations

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{X}^4)^2 + (\tilde{X}^5)^2 &= 1 = (\tilde{X}^6)^2 + (\tilde{X}^7)^2, \\ [\tilde{X}^4, \tilde{X}^5] &= 0 = [\tilde{X}^6, \tilde{X}^7], \\ \tilde{X}^8 &= \tilde{X}^9 = 0\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

The irreducible representations of the clock and shift matrices are well-known [19] and need not be repeated here. These matrices can be viewed as embedding maps

$$\tilde{X}^i \sim \tilde{x}^i : \quad T^2 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^6 \tag{3.6}$$

and we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}^4 + i\tilde{X}^5 &= e^{i\Xi^4} \sim \tilde{x}^4 + i\tilde{x}^5 = e^{i\xi^4}, \\ \tilde{X}^6 + i\tilde{X}^7 &= e^{i\Xi^5} \sim \tilde{x}^6 + i\tilde{x}^7 = e^{i\xi^5} \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

with $\Xi^4, \Xi^5 \in \mathfrak{su}(N)$ and $\{\xi^4, \xi^5\} = \frac{\pi}{N}$ in the semi-classical limit. The spectrum of the corresponding matrix Laplace operator is easily computed:

$$\Box\phi = [\tilde{X}^i, [\tilde{X}^j, \phi]]\delta_{ij} \tag{3.8}$$

$$\Box(U^n V^m) = c([n]_q^2 + [m]_q^2)\, U^n V^m \tag{3.9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} [n]_q &= \frac{\sin(n\pi/N)}{\sin(\pi/N)} \sim n \\ c &= 4\sin^2(\pi/N) \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

This implies

$$\Box\tilde{X}^i = 4\sin^2(\pi/N)\, \tilde{X}^i \qquad i = 4, ..., 9 \tag{3.11}$$

Note that this relations holds trivially for $\tilde{X}^8$ and $\tilde{X}^9$. We also note that the fuzzy torus enjoys a $\mathbb{Z}_N \times \mathbb{Z}_N$ symmetry implemented as gauge transformations

$$U\tilde{Z}^i U^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & q & \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tilde{Z}^i, \qquad V\tilde{Z}^i V^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} q^{-1} & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tilde{Z}^i\ . \tag{3.12}$$

Finally, it should be obvious that the particular embedding chosen in (3.4) can be generalized by acting with $SO(6)$ on the 6 matrices $X^a$. This will be exploited below.

### 3.2 Compactification with rotating fuzzy tori

In this section, we will exhibit an interesting class of solutions of the IKKT model with geometry $M^4 \times \mathcal{K}$, where $\mathcal{K}$ is a rotating version of the above torus. The idea is simply to balance the brane tension with the centripetal force due to the rotation. Some basic solutions of this type were given previously in [12] for the IKKT model, and in [13] for the BFSS model. We give a more general setup which allows to study also their perturbations.

Let $\bar{X}^\mu \sim \bar{x}^\mu,\ \mu = 0, ..., 3$ generate the algebra of functions $\mathcal{A}_\theta$ on the quantum plane $\mathbb{R}^4_\theta$,

$$[\bar{X}^\mu, \bar{X}^\nu] \ = \ i\theta^{\mu\nu} \ , \tag{3.13}$$

with $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ in canonical block-diagonal form. Let $U \sim e^{i\xi^4}$, $V \sim e^{i\xi^5}$ be generators of a fuzzy torus as above, with Poisson bracket

$$\{\xi^4, \xi^5\} = \frac{\pi}{N} \equiv \xi. \tag{3.14}$$

Together with the noncompact coordinates we obtain local coordinates $\xi^a = (x^\mu, \xi^i)$, which are in fact Darboux coordinates with Poisson brackets

$$\theta^{ab} = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta^{01} \\ -\theta^{01} & 0 \end{pmatrix} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta^{23} \\ -\theta^{23} & 0 \end{pmatrix} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \xi \\ -\xi & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.15}$$

We first let the above fuzzy torus rotate along its cycles as follows

$$\tilde{Z}^i = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{X}^4 + i\tilde{X}^5 \\ \tilde{X}^6 + i\tilde{X}^7 \\ \tilde{X}^8 + i\tilde{X}^9 \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{U}_5 \mathcal{U}_4 |z_0\rangle, \qquad\qquad |z_0\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.16}$$

where $\mathcal{U}_{4,5}$ are $3 \times 3$ matrices taking values in $\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{Mat}(N, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}_\theta$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_4 &= \mathrm{diag}(U_4, 1, 1), \qquad \mathcal{U}_5 = \mathrm{diag}(1, U_5, 1) & (3.17) \\ U_4 &= e^{ik^{(4)}_\mu \bar{X}^\mu} U, \quad U_5 = e^{ik^{(5)}_\mu \bar{X}^\mu} V \ , & (3.18) \end{aligned}$$

using the same complexified matrix notation as in (3.3). More general embeddings along arbitrary commuting $U(1)$ subgroups of $SO(6)$ can be obtained as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Z}^i &= \mathcal{U}_5 \mathcal{U}_4 |z_0\rangle, \\ \mathcal{U}_\alpha &= e^{\lambda_\alpha \varphi_\alpha} = \mathcal{O} \mathrm{diag}(U_\alpha^{n_{\alpha,1}}, U_\alpha^{n_{\alpha,2}}, U_\alpha^{n_{\alpha,3}}) \mathcal{O}^{-1} \qquad \in \mathrm{Mat}(6, \mathcal{A}) \\ U_\alpha &= e^{i\varphi^\alpha}, \quad \varphi^\alpha = k^{(\alpha)}_\mu \bar{X}^\mu + \Xi^\alpha + \mathcal{E}^\alpha(\bar{X}, \Xi), \qquad \alpha = 4, 5 \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

where $n_{\alpha,i} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^3 \cong \mathbb{R}^6$. This amounts to choosing commuting generators $\lambda_\alpha$ as follows

$$\lambda_\alpha = \mathcal{O} \begin{pmatrix} n_{\alpha,1} i & & \\ & n_{\alpha,2} i & \\ & & n_{\alpha,3} i \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{O}^{-1} = \mathcal{O} \mathrm{diag}_{\mathbb{C}}(n_{\alpha,1} i, n_{\alpha,2} i, n_{\alpha,3} i) \mathcal{O}^{-1} \qquad \in \mathfrak{so}(6) \tag{3.20}$$

for some $\mathcal{O} \in SO(6)$. To be well-defined in the matrix algebra $\mathcal{A}$, the perturbations $\mathcal{E}^\alpha$ must be polynomials in the fuzzy torus generators $U, V$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{E}^\alpha(\bar{X}, \Xi) = \sum_n \mathcal{E}^\alpha_n(\bar{X}) e^{i(n_4 \Xi^4 + n_5 \Xi^5)}. \tag{3.21}$$

This requirement also motivates the above ansatz for the $\lambda_\alpha$ in terms of $\mathrm{diag}_{\mathbb{C}}(n_1 i, n_2 i, n_3 i)$. We further let this torus rotate along transversal directions via

$$\begin{aligned} X^A = \begin{pmatrix} X^\mu \\ Z^i \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \bar{X}^\mu + \mathcal{E}^\mu(\bar{X}, \Xi) \\ r(\bar{X}, \Xi)\, \mathcal{U}_8 \mathcal{U}_7 \mathcal{U}_6 \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{Z}^1 \\ \tilde{Z}^2 \\ \tilde{Z}^3 \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathcal{U}_\alpha = e^{\lambda_\alpha \varphi^\alpha}, \quad \varphi^\alpha &= k^{(\alpha)}_\mu X^\mu + \mathcal{E}^\alpha(\bar{X}, \Xi), \qquad \alpha = 6, 7, 8 \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

with commuting generators $\lambda_6, \lambda_7, \lambda_8 \in \mathfrak{so}(6)$ as will be specified below. This describes a fuzzy torus which is rotating not only along its cycles but also transversally in $S^5 \subset \mathbb{R}^6$, as $x$ moves along $\mathbb{R}^4$. Note that $r$, $\mathcal{E}^\mu$ and $\mathcal{E}^\alpha$ with $\alpha = 6, 7, 8$ have the same expansion as in (3.21) so that the $e^{\lambda_\alpha \mathcal{E}^\alpha}$ are ”smooth“, i.e. they satisfy the periodicity condition. We will mainly focus on configurations where $\varphi^\alpha$ is linear in $X^\mu, \Xi^\alpha$, and $k^{(7)} = k^{(8)} = 0$. We furthermore assume that the radius function $r(X)$ is constant, which will be justified below.

It should be clear that the above ansatz can be generalized to 4-dimensional compactifications $\mathcal{K}$. We will also consider analogous (”type C”) configurations with 3 mutually commuting matrices $\lambda_{4,5,6}$ in (3.19) (with $\Xi^6 = 0$) and 2 mutually commuting matrices $\lambda_{7,8}$ in (3.22).

**Semi-classical form.** In the semi-classical (Poisson) limit, we can write the above configurations more systematically as follows:

$$x^A = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{x}^\mu + \mathcal{E}^\mu(\xi) \\ r(x)\, \mathcal{U}_8 \mathcal{U}_7 \mathcal{U}_6 \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{z}^1 \\ \tilde{z}^2 \\ \tilde{z}^3 \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{x}^\mu + \mathcal{E}^\mu(\xi) \\ r(x)\, \mathcal{U}_8 \mathcal{U}_7 \mathcal{U}_6 \mathcal{U}_5 \mathcal{U}_4 |z_0\rangle \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.23}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_\alpha = e^{\lambda_\alpha \varphi^\alpha}, \quad \varphi^\alpha &= k^{(\alpha)}_a \xi^a + \mathcal{E}^\alpha, \qquad \alpha = 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 \\ \tilde{z}^i &= \mathcal{U}_5 \mathcal{U}_4 |z_0\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Here $\lambda_4, \lambda_5 \in \mathfrak{so}(6)$ are mutually commuting generators of rotations along both $S^1$ of the torus (3.4), and $\lambda_6, \lambda_7, \lambda_8 \in \mathfrak{so}(6)$ are further generators of rotations transversal to the torus. The $\mathcal{E}^\alpha$ determine perturbations of the background. For $\mathcal{E}^\alpha = 0$, these configurations are specified by the momenta $k^{(\alpha)}$, whose non-compact components $k^{(\alpha)}_\mu$ will play a role similar to a vielbein. The radius function $r(x)$ will be constant in most of the following. For low energies this is in fact a consequence of the non-vanishing flux on $T^2$, as we will show later.

The motivation for these group-theoretical constructions is that all perturbations (for fixed $r$) can be described in terms of the $\mathcal{E}^\alpha$, exhibiting the relation with the global $SO(6)$ symmetry.

**Metric.** The above parametrization is adapted to the embedding $\mathcal{K} \subset S^5 \subset \mathbb{R}^6$, and the $\varphi^\alpha, \alpha = 4, ..., 8$ can be viewed as local coordinates on $S^5$. The embedding metric on $S^5 \subset \mathbb{R}^6$

in these local coordinates $\varphi^\alpha$ on $S^5$ is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
g^{(S^5)}_{\alpha\beta} &= \sum_{i=4}^{9}(\lambda_\alpha \tilde{x}^i)(\lambda_\beta \tilde{x}_i) = r^2 \langle z_0|{\mathcal{U}_5}^\dagger {\mathcal{U}_4}^\dagger \frac{1}{2}(\lambda^\dagger_\alpha \lambda_\beta + \lambda^\dagger_\beta \lambda_\alpha)\mathcal{U}_4 \mathcal{U}_5 |z_0\rangle \\
&= -r^2 \langle z_0|{\mathcal{U}_5}^\dagger {\mathcal{U}_4}^\dagger \lambda_\alpha \lambda_\beta \mathcal{U}_4 \mathcal{U}_5 |z_0\rangle. \qquad (3.25)
\end{aligned}
$$

We will write $g^{(S^5)}_{\alpha\beta} \equiv g_{\alpha\beta}$ if no confusion can arise. We can now compute the embedding metric and the effective metric on $\mathcal{M}$ in Darboux coordinates:

$$
\begin{aligned}
g_{ab}dx^a dx^b &= (\partial_a x^\mu \partial_b x^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu} + \partial_a x^i \partial_b x_i) dx^a dx^b \\
&= \big(\eta_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\nu \mathcal{E}^\rho \eta_{\mu\rho} + \partial_\mu \mathcal{E}^\eta \eta_{\eta\nu} + \partial_\mu \mathcal{E}_\eta \partial_\nu \mathcal{E}^\eta\big) dx^\mu dx^\nu + g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{ab} dx^a dx^b \\
\gamma^{ab} &= \theta^{aa'}\theta^{bb'} g_{a'b'}\ . \qquad (3.26)
\end{aligned}
$$

Here

$$
g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{ab} = \sum_{i=4}^{9} \partial_a x^i \partial_b x_i \ = \ \partial_a \varphi^\alpha \partial_b \varphi^\beta g^{(S^5)}_{\alpha\beta} \ \overset{\mathcal{E}=0}{=} \ k^\alpha_a k^\beta_b \, g^{(S^5)}_{\alpha\beta} \qquad (3.27)
$$

is the contribution due to $\mathcal{K}$. Hence for $\mathcal{E} = 0$, the embedding metric on $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathcal{K}$ is

$$
g_{ab}|_{\mathcal{E}=0} = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_{\mu\nu} + g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{\mu\nu} & g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{\mu i} \\ g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{i\mu} & g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{ij} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_{\mu\nu} + k^\alpha_\mu k^\beta_\nu g_{\alpha\beta} & k^\alpha_i k^\beta_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} \\ k^\alpha_\mu k^\beta_i \, g_{\alpha\beta} & k^\alpha_i k^\beta_j \, g_{\alpha\beta} \end{pmatrix} \qquad (3.28)
$$

Including perturbations, the 4-dimensional embedding metric is

$$
\begin{aligned}
g_{\mu\nu} &= (g_{\mu\nu})|_{\mathcal{E}=0} + \delta_{\mathcal{E}} g_{\mu\nu} \\
\delta_{\mathcal{E}} g_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\nu \mathcal{E}^\rho \eta_{\mu\rho} + \partial_\mu \mathcal{E}^\eta \eta_{\eta\nu} + (k^\alpha_\mu \partial_\nu \mathcal{E}^\beta + \partial_\mu \mathcal{E}^\alpha k^\beta_\nu) g_{\alpha\beta} + \ k^\alpha_\mu k^\beta_\nu \, \mathcal{E}^\gamma \frac{\partial g_{\alpha\beta}}{\partial \varphi^\gamma} + \ \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{E}^2) \qquad (3.29)
\end{aligned}
$$

The crucial point is that linear fluctuations of the ”internal“ sector of the model contribute to the 4-dimensional metric, coupled via $k^\alpha_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$. This is a key difference from ordinary (commutative) $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM theory, where the $U(1)$ sector completely decouples and the analogous internal perturbations would not contribute to the effective 4-dimensional metric.

## 3.3 Semi-classical equations of motion

Now we establish whether this ansatz (3.23) provides solutions of the equations of motion $\Box X^A = 0$, for the undeformed case $\mathcal{E}^\alpha = 0$. We first restrict ourselves to the semi-classical case, establishing the equations of motion at the Poisson level, and moreover we assume $r = const$ here. First, the equation $\Box X^\mu = 0$ for the non-compact components reduces semi-classically to

$$
\Box_G x^\mu = -\Gamma^\mu + \Box_G \mathcal{E}^\mu = 0 \qquad (3.30)
$$

in Darboux coordinates, where

$$
\Gamma^b = -\Box_G \xi^b = -e^{-\sigma} \partial_a \gamma^{ab}. \qquad (3.31)
$$

The equation for the compact components $\Box X^i = 0$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\{x^A, \{x_A, z^i\}\} &= \theta^{aa'}\theta^{bb'}\partial_a x^A \partial_{a'}\big(\partial_b x_A \partial_{b'} z^i\big) \\ &= \theta^{aa'}\theta^{bb'}\partial_{a'}\big(g_{ab}\partial_{b'} z^i\big) \\ &= \partial_a\big(\gamma^{ab}\partial_b z^i\big) = (\gamma^{ab}\partial_a - e^{\sigma}\Gamma^b)\partial_b z^i\end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

Noting that

$$\partial_a \mathcal{U}_\alpha = \partial_a \varphi^\alpha(x)\lambda_\alpha \mathcal{U}_\alpha, \qquad \text{(no sum over } \alpha) \tag{3.33}$$

this can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\{x^A, \{x_A, z\}\} =&\ r\,\mathcal{U}_6\mathcal{U}_7\mathcal{U}_8(\partial_a(\gamma^{ab}\partial_b\varphi^\alpha)\lambda_\alpha + \gamma^{ab}\partial_a\varphi^\alpha(x)\partial_b\varphi^\beta(x) : \lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta :)\mathcal{U}_4\mathcal{U}_5\ |z_0\rangle \\ \overset{\mathcal{E}=0}{=}&\ r\,\mathcal{U}_6\mathcal{U}_7\mathcal{U}_8(-e^{\sigma}\Gamma^a k_a^{(\alpha)}\lambda_\alpha + \bar{\gamma}^{ab}k_a^{(\alpha)}k_b^{(\beta)} : \lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta :)\mathcal{U}_4\mathcal{U}_5\ |z_0\rangle\end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

Here the :: indicates ”normal ordering“, i.e. the $\lambda_i$ are arranged in order $6, 7, 8, 4, 5$. Therefore we certainly obtain a solution of $\{x^A, \{x_A, x^B\}\} = 0$ if the $k^{(\alpha)}$ can be chosen such that

$$\begin{aligned}\Box_G x^\mu &= -\Gamma^\mu + \Box_G \mathcal{E}^\mu = 0 \\ \Box\varphi^\alpha &= 0, \qquad \text{and} \quad \gamma^{ab}\partial_a\varphi^\alpha(x)\partial_b\varphi^\beta(x) : \lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta := 0\ .\end{aligned} \tag{3.35}$$

For the unperturbed background with $\mathcal{E} = 0$, this reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^a &= 0 \\ \gamma^{ab}k_a^\alpha k_b^\beta : \lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta : &= 0\end{aligned} \tag{3.36}$$

This will be discussed separately for three types of configurations. We also note that (3.35) together with (3.25) implies in particular

$$\gamma^{ab} g_{ab}^{(\mathcal{K})} = 0 \tag{3.37}$$

This determines the radius $r$, as discussed in more detail in Section 3.5.

**Type A solutions.** Type A solutions are characterized by $\mathcal{U}_6 = \mathcal{U}_7 = \mathcal{U}_8 = \mathbb{1}$ (hence $k^{(6)} = k^{(7)} = k^{(8)} = 0$) and 2 generators $\lambda_\alpha,\ \alpha = 4, 5$ which satisfy $-\lambda_4^2 + \lambda_5^2 = 0$. Then the above semi-classical equations of motion are solved if

$$\gamma^{\alpha\beta} = \gamma^{ab}\partial_a\varphi^\alpha\partial_b\varphi^\beta = p^2\eta^{\alpha\beta} = p^2\mathrm{diag}(-1, 1) \qquad \text{for} \ \ \alpha, \beta = 4, 5 \tag{3.38}$$

where $p^2$ is some scalar (function). Then (3.35) holds since $-\lambda_4^2 + \lambda_5^2 = 0$. In the unperturbed case, $\mathcal{E} = 0$, $g_{\alpha\beta}^{(S^5)}$ is constant for $\alpha, \beta = 4, 5$ by construction, so that both $g_{ab}$ and $\gamma^{ab}$ are constant. Hence this class of solutions is characterized by two momenta $(k^{(4)}, k^{(5)})$ which form an orthonormal 2-bein

$$\gamma^{ab}k_a^{(\alpha)}k_b^{(\beta)} = p^2\eta^{\alpha\beta} \tag{3.39}$$

with respect to the effective metric. Notice that this is in general a quartic equation in the $k_a^{(\alpha)}$ since

$$\gamma^{ab}k_a^{(\alpha)}k_b^{(\beta)} = \eta_{\mu\nu}\theta^{\mu\mu'}\theta^{\nu\nu'}k_\mu^{(\alpha)}k_\nu^{(\beta)} + \Theta^{\alpha\alpha'}\Theta^{\beta\beta'}g_{\alpha'\beta'} \tag{3.40}$$

where

$$\Theta^{\alpha\beta} = \{\varphi^\alpha, \varphi^\beta\} \overset{\mathcal{E}=0}{=} k_a^{(\alpha)}k_b^{(\beta)}\theta^{ab} \tag{3.41}$$

We will see that type A solutions are characterized by 2 non-trivial constant currents and a $\mathbb{Z}_N \times \mathbb{Z}_N$ symmetry. The induced metric on $\mathcal{M}^6$ in $(x^\mu, \varphi^\alpha)$ coordinates is constant given by $(\eta_{\mu\nu}, g_{\alpha\beta})$, and the structure is very similar to a quantum plane. In Appendix B.1, we give explicit solutions of this type.

**Type B solutions.** Type B solutions are characterized by $\mathcal{U}_7 = \mathcal{U}_8 = \mathbb{1}$ (i.e. $k^{(7)} = k^{(8)} = 0$) and 3 generators $\lambda_\alpha$, $\alpha = 4, 5, 6$ which satisfy $-\lambda_4^2 + \lambda_5^2 + \lambda_6^2 = 0$, and

$$\gamma^{\alpha\beta} = \gamma^{ab}\partial_a\varphi^\alpha\partial_b\varphi^\beta = p^2\eta^{\alpha\beta} = p^2\mathrm{diag}(-1,1,1) \qquad \text{for} \;\; \alpha,\beta = 4,5,6 \tag{3.42}$$

$$\bar{\gamma}^{ab}k_a^{(\alpha)}k_b^{(\beta)} = p^2\eta^{\alpha\beta} \qquad \text{for} \;\; \mathcal{E} = 0 \tag{3.43}$$

In the unperturbed case $\mathcal{E} = 0$, this is characterized by three momenta $(k^{(4)}, k^{(5)}, k^{(6)})$ which form an orthonormal 3-bein with respect to the effective metric, where $k^{(4)}$ is time-like. Note that $\lambda_6$ does not commute with $\lambda_4, \lambda_5$ for type B. An explicit choice of $\lambda$'s and the corresponding metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$ can be found in Appendix B.2. Using this explicit form (B.6) of $g_{\alpha\beta}^{(S^5)}$, the condition $\partial_a\gamma^{ab} = 0$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\theta^{aa'}\partial_{a'}g_{ab}^{(\mathcal{K})} &= \theta^{aa'}\partial_{a'}(k_a^{(5)}k_b^{(6)}g_{56}^{(S^5)}(\varphi^4) + k_a^{(6)}k_b^{(5)}g_{65}^{(S^5)}(\varphi^4)) \\ &= (\Theta^{46}k_b^{(5)} + \Theta^{45}k_b^{(6)})\frac{\partial g_{56}^{(S^5)}(\varphi^4)}{\partial\varphi^4} = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{3.44}$$

which requires $\Theta^{46}k_b^{(5)} = -\Theta^{45}k_b^{(6)}$, and therefore $\Theta^{46} = 0 = \Theta^{45}$. Furthermore, there are potentially non-constant contributions in the orthogonality condition (3.40) arising from $(\Theta^{\alpha5}\Theta^{\beta6} + \Theta^{\alpha6}\Theta^{\beta5})g_{56}^{(S^5)}(\varphi^4)$. This implies that either $\Theta^{\alpha5} = 0$ or $\Theta^{\alpha6} = 0$. Therefore

$$\Theta^{\alpha\beta} = 0\ , \qquad \alpha,\beta = 4,5,6\ , \tag{3.45}$$

which means that the $\varphi^{(\alpha)} = k_a^{(\alpha)}\xi^a$ form 3 mutually Poisson-commuting fields on $\mathcal{M}^6$. This also means that the quartic term in (3.40) drops out, and there is a non-empty moduli space of type B solutions as shown in Appendix B.2.

**Type C solutions.** Type C solutions are characterized by $\mathcal{U}_7 = \mathcal{U}_8 = \mathbb{1}$ (i.e. $k^{(7)} = k^{(8)} = 0$) and 3 mutually commuting generators $\lambda_\alpha$, $\alpha = 4, 5, 6$ which satisfy $-\lambda_4^2 + \lambda_5^2 + \lambda_6^2 = 0$, and

$$\gamma^{\alpha\beta} = \bar{\gamma}^{ab}\partial_a\varphi^\alpha\partial_b\varphi^\beta = p^2\eta^{\alpha\beta} = p^2\,\mathrm{diag}(-1,1,1) \qquad \text{for} \;\; \alpha = 4,5,6 \tag{3.46}$$

$$\bar{\gamma}^{ab}k_a^{(\alpha)}k_b^{(\beta)} = p^2\eta^{\alpha\beta} \qquad \text{for} \;\; \mathcal{E} = 0 \tag{3.47}$$

This entails some obvious modifications in formulae (3.19), (3.25), and (3.34). In the unperturbed case, this is characterized by 3 momenta $k_a^{(\alpha)}$ which form an orthonormal 3-bein with respect to the effective metric, and $k^{(4)}$ is again time-like. In this case we do not need $\Theta^{\alpha\beta} = 0$ since, by construction, $g_{\alpha\beta}$ is independent of $\varphi$ for $\alpha, \beta = 4, 5, 6$, so that, as for type A, $k_a^\alpha k_b^\beta g_{\alpha\beta} = \text{const}$, and therefore $\gamma^{ab} = \text{const}$. Hence these solutions are intrinsically flat, and turn out to support 3 constant currents and a $\mathbb{Z}_N \times \mathbb{Z}_N$ symmetry. An example of a type C solution is given in Appendix B.3.

In summary, we have obtained 3 types of compactified brane solutions of the semi-classical equations of motion. They correspond in fact to exact matrix solutions of $\Box X^B = 0$, as shown Appendix C.

**Effective metric.** The 4-dimensional effective metric which governs the long-distance physics on $\mathcal{M}$ is given by

$$\gamma^{\mu\nu}_{(4D)} = \theta^{\mu\mu'}\theta^{\nu\nu'}\eta_{\mu'\nu'} + \theta^{\mu a}\theta^{\nu b} k_a^{(\alpha)} k_b^{(\beta)} g_{\alpha\beta} \tag{3.48}$$

which is determined by the $k^\alpha$. The important point is that these $k_a^\alpha \approx \partial_a \varphi^\alpha$ play a role similar to a vielbein, and they are dynamical (albeit not independent as in general relativity). Some of them will be related to conserved currents below. This effective metric is constant for type A and C, and oscillating for type $B$ according to $g_{\alpha\beta}$ (and should therefore be averaged at low energies). Our aim is to understand the response of this metric to matter, which means to understand the effective gravitational dynamics on $\mathcal{M}$.

## 3.4 Currents and conservation laws

Consider the $SO(6)$ currents (A.6)

$$J_{(\underline{\alpha})a} = (\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}})_{ji} x^i \partial_a x^j, \qquad \lambda_{\underline{\alpha}} \in \mathfrak{so}(6) \tag{3.49}$$

which arise from matrix model currents as discussed in appendix A.2. Here and in the following we denote with $\underline{\alpha}$ an arbitrary generator of $\mathfrak{so}(6)$, while $\alpha$ indicates the particular generators chosen for $\alpha = 4, .., 8$. In the absence of matter, these currents satisfy the following conservation law

$$\nabla^a J_{(\underline{\alpha})a} = 0\ . \tag{3.50}$$

For the above solutions, some of these currents are non-vanishing. They can be computed via

$$J_{(\underline{\alpha})a} = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}} z^i)^\dagger \partial_a z^i + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_a z^i)^\dagger \lambda_{\underline{\alpha}} z^i\ . \tag{3.51}$$

which is complicated for a general $\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}}$, and most currents vary along $\mathcal{K}$. However for $\alpha = (6,)7, 8$ corresponding to transversal deformations ($\alpha = 6$ being excluded for type C), they take a simple form related to the metric:

$$\begin{aligned} J_{(\alpha)a} \sim -\frac{1}{2}\sum_\beta \partial_a \varphi^\beta (\tilde{z}^i)^\dagger \big(\lambda_\alpha \lambda_\beta + \lambda_\beta \lambda_\alpha\big) \tilde{z}^i &= \sum_\beta \partial_a \varphi^\beta g_{\alpha\beta}, \qquad \alpha = (6,)7, 8 \\ &\equiv L_{(\alpha)a} \end{aligned} \tag{3.52}$$

which holds even including perturbations. Here we introduce the following notation

$$L_{(\alpha)a} := \partial_a\varphi^\beta g_{\alpha\beta}, \qquad \alpha = 4,5,6,7,8 \tag{3.53}$$

For type A and C, the unperturbed currents for $\alpha = 4,5,...,8$ can be written as

$$J_{(\alpha)a}|_{\mathcal{E}=0} = L_{(\alpha)a}|_{\mathcal{E}=0} = k_a^\beta g_{\beta\alpha}, \qquad \alpha = 4,5,...,8 \tag{3.54}$$

Using the explicit results for $g_{\alpha\beta}$ in appendix B, we note that type $A$ solutions have 2 constant currents $J_{(4,5)} \neq 0$, and type $C$ solutions have 3 constant currents $J_{(4,5,6)} \neq 0$. We expect that the solutions are to some extent characterized as ”ground states“ for these given currents. Finally, the contribution from $\mathcal{K}$ to the embedding metric (3.28) can be written in terms of these $L_a$ as

$$g_{ab}^{(\mathcal{K})} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta=4}^{8} \partial_a\varphi_a^{(\alpha)}\partial_b\varphi^{(\beta)}\, g_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_{\alpha=4}^{8} \partial_a\varphi^\alpha L_{(\alpha)b} = \sum_{\alpha=4}^{8} \partial_b\varphi^\alpha L_{(\alpha)a} \tag{3.55}$$

which reduces to $g_{ab}^{(\mathcal{K})} = \sum k_a^\alpha J_{(\alpha)b} = \sum k_b^\alpha J_{(\alpha)a}$ for the unperturbed backgrounds.

**Current conservation.** As a consistency check, let us verify conservation of the currents $J_a^{(\alpha)}$, $\alpha = 4,...,8$ for the unperturbed type A and C solutions. We can write the conservation law as

$$\partial_a(\gamma^{ab}J_{(\alpha)b}) = -e^\sigma\Gamma^b J_{(\alpha)b} + \gamma^{ab}K_{(\alpha)ab}, \qquad \alpha = 4,5,...,8 \tag{3.56}$$

where

$$2K_{(\alpha)ab} := \partial_a J_{(\alpha)b} + \partial_b J_{(\alpha)a} = k_b^{(\beta)}k_a^{(\gamma)}\,\Big(\frac{\partial g_{\alpha\beta}}{\partial\varphi^\gamma} + \frac{\partial g_{\alpha\gamma}}{\partial\varphi^\beta}\Big) \tag{3.57}$$

(for $\mathcal{E} = 0$) is related to the extrinsic curvature of the brane. Since $\Gamma^b = 0$ as verified above, this leads to

$$\gamma^{ab}K_{(\alpha)ab} = p^2\,\eta^{\beta\gamma}\frac{\partial g_{\beta\alpha}}{\partial\varphi^\gamma} = 0 \tag{3.58}$$

which follows from the orthogonality condition (3.38), and the explicit $g_{\alpha\beta}$ in Appendix B. In principle, these conservation laws should completely capture the equations of motion for perturbations with fixed radius. However, we will not pursue this any further here.

We will see that the presence of these symmetries leads to massless (Goldstone) modes, including the $\mathcal{E}^\alpha$. Moreover they couple linearly to the metric, which implies that these are some sort of gravitational modes.

## 3.5 Flux stabilization

We want to understand the dynamics of the compactification radius $r$. Assuming an unperturbed compactification of the above type, the semi-classical matrix model action is given by

$$S_{\rm YM} \sim -\int\sqrt{\theta^{-1}}\;\gamma^{ab}g_{ab} = -\int\sqrt{G}\;V(r)$$

$$V(r) = e^{-\sigma}\Big(\eta_{\mu'\nu'}\theta^{\mu'\mu}\theta^{\nu'\nu}(\eta_{\mu\nu} + 2g_{\mu\nu}^{(\mathcal{K})}) + \Theta^{\alpha\alpha'}\Theta^{\beta\beta'}g_{\alpha\beta}^{(\mathcal{K})}g_{\alpha'\beta'}^{(\mathcal{K})}\Big) \tag{3.59}$$

recalling the antisymmetric matrix $\Theta^{\alpha\beta} = \{\varphi^\alpha, \varphi^\beta\}$ (3.41). Since $g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{\alpha\beta} \sim r^2$, this gives a quartic potential $V(r) = V_0 + ar^2 + br^4$ in the compactification radius $r$, which we consider as variable here. Now we have to distinguish two cases. First, assume $\Theta^{\alpha\beta} \not\equiv 0$, so that there is some flux on $\mathcal{K}$. Then the quartic term in $V(r)$ is positive, leading to an effective potential for $r$ with minimum at $\bar{r}$ determined by

$$0 = \eta^{(4)}_{\mu\nu}\theta^{\mu\mu'}\theta^{\nu\nu'}g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{\mu\nu} + \Theta^{\alpha\alpha'}\Theta^{\beta\beta'}g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{\alpha\beta}g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{\alpha'\beta'} = \gamma^{ab}g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{ab} \ . \tag{3.60}$$

This coincides with the condition (3.37) found previously. In order to have $\bar{r}^2 > 0$ we must have $\eta^{(4)}_{\mu\nu}\theta^{\mu\mu'}\theta^{\nu\nu'}g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{\mu\nu} < 0$, so that the potential has a unique minimum at $\bar{r}^2 > 0$ and mass

$$m_r^2 = V''|_{\bar{r}} = -4\eta^{(4)}_{\mu\nu}\theta^{\mu\mu'}\theta^{\nu\nu'}g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{\mu\nu} \ > 0 \ . \tag{3.61}$$

The scale is set by $r$ and the noncommutative structure $\theta^{ab}$, which are both UV scales. This means that the radial perturbations are stabilized by the flux and massive, and we can safely set $r = const$ at low energies.

On the other hand if $\Theta^{\alpha\beta} \equiv 0$, then the potential $V(r)$ is flat, leading to a massless radial mode. Although this mode is interesting because it couples to the energy-momentum tensor [10], it probably acquires a mass via quantum corrections since it is not protected by any symmetry. We therefore focus on the case $\Theta^{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$ from now on, for type A or C solutions.

# 4 Gauge theory interpretation

The solutions found above were interpreted up to now in terms of a brane with 6-dimensional effective geometry. Now we use the interpretation of the the matrix model as noncommutative $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM theory on $\mathbb{R}^4_\theta$ with gauge group $U(N)$, via

$$X^A = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{X}^\mu \otimes \mathbb{1}_N \\ Z^i \end{pmatrix} . \tag{4.1}$$

Here the transversal matrices are renamed as

$$Z^i = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^1 + i\phi^2 \\ \phi^3 + i\phi^4 \\ \phi^5 + i\phi^6 \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.2}$$

and interpreted as 6 scalar fields on $\mathbb{R}^4_\theta$ in the adjoint representation of $U(N)$. The $SO(9,1)$ symmetry of the model then decomposes into $SO(3,1) \times SO(6)$, where $SO(6)$ is the R-symmetry group of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM. The emergence of fuzzy spaces from nonabelian gauge theory from nonabelian scalar fields is well-known by now, and the equivalence of these two interpretations of the matrix model constitutes the starting point underlying emergent gravity matrix models [6]. More specifically, we interpret the solutions (3.22) in terms of coherent plane wave excitations of the 6 $U(N)$-valued scalar fields $Z^i$, propagating along 2 resp. 3 momenta $k^{(\alpha)}$. "Coherence" here refers to particular $\mathfrak{su}(N)$ structure which is chosen such that an effective toroidal geometry arises for large $N$.

The field-theoretic view is useful here for at least two reasons. First, it allows to compute and compare different solutions and their currents resp. energy-momentum tensors, and select the preferred (lowest-energy) solutions for a given set of quantum numbers. Second, it makes manifest the UV finiteness of the model, since the VEV of the scalar fields becomes irrelevant in the UV where the model reduces to the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ model on $\mathbb{R}^4_\theta$. Nevertheless, this interpretation does not alter the fact that the effective metric for excitations around these solutions is given by (2.10), so that perturbations lead to a modified effective 4-dimensional metric. This is the key difference compared with commutative $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM theory.

## 4.1 Translational invariance and periodicity

Without perturbations, the ansatz (3.22) defines a periodic structure on the non-compact space $\mathbb{R}^4$ defined by the 2 or 3 non-vanishing momenta $k_\mu^{(\alpha)}$. We can introduce a reciprocal basis $a^\mu_{(\alpha)}$ for the subspace spanned by these momenta supplemented by vectors $b^\mu_{(\alpha')}$ such that

$$k_\mu^{(\beta)} a^\mu_{(\alpha)} = 2\pi\delta^\beta_\alpha, \qquad k_\mu^{(\beta)} b^\mu_{(\alpha')} = 0. \tag{4.3}$$

Then clearly the $\phi^i$ are invariant under $x^\mu \to x^\mu + a^\mu_{(\alpha)}$, and $b^\mu_{(\alpha')}\partial_\mu \phi^i(x) = 0$. These translations can be implemented by gauge transformations on $\mathbb{R}^4_\theta$ via

$$\phi^i(X^\mu + a^\mu) = T_a \phi^i(X^\mu) T_a^{-1} = \phi^i(X^\mu), \qquad T_a = e^{ia^\mu \theta^{-1}_{\mu\nu}\bar{X}^\nu} \tag{4.4}$$

for $a = a^\mu_{(\alpha)}$, and

$$\phi^i(X^\mu + b^\mu) = T_b \phi^i T_b^{-1} = \phi^i(X^\mu) \tag{4.5}$$

for $b = b^\mu_{(\alpha')}$. Moreover, the lattice spanned by the $a^\mu_{(4,5)}$ has a sub-structure defined by the $\mathbb{Z}_N \times \mathbb{Z}_N$ symmetry of the fuzzy tori, which amounts to a discrete translation invariance[7]

$$\begin{aligned} U\phi^i(X^\mu)U^{-1} &= \phi^i(X^\mu + \frac{1}{N}a^\mu_{(4)}) \overset{A,C}{=} \left(e^{\frac{2\pi}{N}\lambda_4}\right)^i{}_j\, \phi^j(X^\mu), \\ V\phi^i(X^\mu)V^{-1} &= \phi^i(X^\mu + \frac{1}{N}a^\mu_{(5)}) \overset{A,C}{=} \left(e^{\frac{2\pi}{N}\lambda_5}\right)^i{}_j\, \phi^j(X^\mu) \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

The last equality holds only[8] for type A and C, which thereby respect a global $\mathbb{Z}_N \times \mathbb{Z}_N$ R-symmetry up to gauge transformations. Furthermore for type B and C we have

$$e^{2\pi c\lambda_6}\phi^i(X) = T^{-1}_{ca_{(6)}}\phi^i(X^\mu)\, T_{ca_{(6)}} \tag{4.7}$$

for arbitrary $c$. In the semi-classical limit $N \to \infty$, we can introduce the 6 generators

$$\begin{aligned} P_\mu &= \theta^{-1}_{\mu\nu}\{X^\nu, .\} = \partial_\mu, \\ P_i &= \theta^{-1}_{ij}\{\xi^j, .\} = \partial_i \ . \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

---

[7] The compactification of the IKKT model considered in [15] are characterized by similar relations, but were interpreted in a very different way. The present considerations show that such solutions appear as non-compact periodic backgrounds for perturbations which propagate on them.

[8] The conjugation with $U$ resp. $V$ induces a $\lambda_{4,5}$ factor between the normal-ordered operators $\mathcal{U}_{67845}$ in (3.22), which for type A and C can be commuted to the left since $\lambda_6$ commutes with $\lambda_{4,5}$.

Then the above discrete lattice symmetry implies

$$\Big(a^\mu_{(\alpha)}P_\mu - P_\alpha\Big)\phi^i = 0 \overset{A,C}{=} \Big(\delta^i_j a^\mu_{(\alpha)}P_\mu - 2\pi\lambda_\alpha{}^i{}_j\Big)\phi^j\ , \qquad \alpha = 4,5$$
$$0 = \Big(\delta^i_j a^\mu_{(6)}P_\mu - 2\pi\lambda_6{}^i{}_j\Big)\phi^j, \qquad \text{for type B and C .} \tag{4.9}$$

Therefore the solutions under considerations are not vacua in the usual sense of quantum field theory, but can be considered as "generalized vacua" which enjoy a discrete translational invariance analogous to solid state theory. This discrete translational invariance should characterize the states under consideration. In view of the enhanced symmetry (4.6) resp. (4.9), type A or C seem to be more natural candidates for "vacuum" geometries.

## 4.2 Kaluza-Klein modes

For the toroidal compactifications under consideration, all modes (both for the geometry as well as for matter or gauge fields) can be decomposed into Kaluza Klein (KK) modes,

$$\Phi(x,\xi) = \sum_{n,m} \Phi_{n,m}(x)e^{in\xi^4+m\xi^5} \equiv \sum_{n,m=-N/2}^{N_2} \Phi_{n,m}(x)\, U^n V^m\ . \tag{4.10}$$

Even though the metric $\gamma^{ab}$ does not respect the product structure $\mathcal{M}^6 = \mathcal{M}^4 \times \mathcal{K}$, for type A and C $\gamma^{ab}$ is constant, i.e., the effective Laplacian respects the $U(1)^2$ symmetry (more precisely, the $\mathbb{Z}_N \times \mathbb{Z}_N$ symmetry), and therefore the above decomposition. Explicitly,

$$\Box\Phi(x,\xi) = \sum_{n,m} U^n V^m \big( - c_{n,m}\Phi_{n,m} + 2iA^\mu_{n,m}\partial_\mu\Phi_{n,m} + \partial_\mu(\gamma^{\mu\nu}\partial_\nu\Phi_{n,m})\big) \tag{4.11}$$

with

$$c_{n,m} = \gamma^{44}n^2 + 2\gamma^{45}nm + \gamma^{55}m^2,$$
$$A^\mu_{n,m} = \gamma^{\mu 4}n + \gamma^{\mu 5}m.$$

Setting

$$\nabla^{n,m}_\mu = \partial_\mu + i\gamma_{\mu\nu}A^\mu_{n,m},$$

where $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ is the inverse of the 4D $\gamma$ metric, we may write the wave equation for $\Phi_{n,m}$ as

$$\left(\gamma^{\mu\nu}\nabla^{n,m}_\mu\nabla^{n,m}_\nu + A^\mu_{n,m}\gamma_{\mu\nu}A^\nu_{n,m} - c_{n,m}\right)\Phi_{n,m}.$$

The "vector potentials" $A^\mu_{n,m}$ simply shift the origin of momentum space. Regarding stability, it is thus important to check that $A^\mu_{n,m}\gamma_{\mu\nu}A^\nu_{n,m} - c_{n,m}$ is negative. We may write it as

$$A^\mu_{n,m}\gamma_{\mu\nu}A^\nu_{n,m} - c_{n,m} = \begin{pmatrix} n & m\end{pmatrix} Q \begin{pmatrix} n \\ m\end{pmatrix}$$

with some 2 × 2 matrix $Q$. For our type A and C solutions one explicitly checks that this matrix is negative definite, so we indeed have stability of the KK modes.

The above reduction to 4-dimensions by keeping only the trivial KK modes in $U, V$ can be written more geometrically as

$$\langle . \rangle := \frac{1}{(2\pi)} \int \sqrt{\theta^{-1}_{ij}}\, d\xi^4 d\xi^5 \ \sim \ \mathrm{tr}_N(.)\ . \tag{4.12}$$

For type A and C, this amounts to an averaging procedure over the compactification $\mathcal{K}$. However for type B, it effectively averages also over a unit cell of the 4-dimensional periodicity identified in section 4.1. We can then introduce the reduced effective metric $G^{\mu\nu}_{(4D)}$

$$G^{\mu\nu}_{(4D)} = e^{-\sigma(4)}\, \gamma^{\mu\nu}_{(4D)}, \qquad \gamma^{\mu\nu}_{(4D)} = \langle \gamma^{\mu\nu} \rangle, \qquad e^{-\sigma(4D)} \ = \frac{\sqrt{|\theta^{-1}_{\mu\nu}|}}{\sqrt{|G^{(4D)}_{\mu\nu}|}} \tag{4.13}$$

(cf. (3.48) and section 5.1 in [10]). This metric governs the action for the lowest KK modes. For example, the action for a scalar field $\phi(x)$ takes the form

$$S[\phi] = \int d^4x \sqrt{\theta^{-1}_{\mu\nu}}\, \gamma^{\mu\nu}_{(4)} \partial_\mu\phi\partial_\nu\phi = \int d^4x \sqrt{|G^{(4)}|}\, G^{\mu\nu}_{(4)} \partial_\mu\phi\partial_\nu\phi \tag{4.14}$$

recalling that the Poisson structure separates nicely in Darboux coordinates.

# 5 Geometry, perturbations and curvature

## 5.1 Perturbations and coupling to matter

Under perturbations of the parameters $\varphi^\alpha$ for $\alpha = 4, ..., 8$, the variation of the embedding metric around a general background is given in Darboux coordinates by

$$\delta_{\mathcal{E}} g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{ab} = \partial_a \mathcal{E}^\alpha L_{\alpha b} + \partial_b \mathcal{E}^\alpha L_{\alpha a} + \partial_a \varphi^\alpha \partial_b \varphi^\beta \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\varphi^\gamma} g_{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{E}^\gamma \tag{5.1}$$

Note that the unperturbed type A and C backgrounds are intrinsically flat, so that the derivatives w.r.t. Darboux coordinates are actually the covariant background derivatives, $\partial_a \equiv \nabla_a$. For type A or C backgrounds, the last term vanishes

$$k^\alpha_a k^\beta_b \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\varphi^\gamma} g_{\alpha\beta} = 0 \tag{5.2}$$

as for these types $g_{\alpha\beta}$ is constant for $\alpha, \beta = 4, 5, (6)$, cf. Section 3.3. Taking into account also the non-compact variations $\mathcal{E}^\mu$ for $\mu = 0, ..., 3$, the same form (5.1) holds for the full 6-dimensional metric perturbation

$$\delta_{\mathcal{E}} g_{ab} = \partial_a \mathcal{E}^\alpha L_{\alpha b} + \partial_b \mathcal{E}^\alpha L_{\alpha a} + \partial_a \varphi^\alpha \partial_b \varphi^\beta \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\varphi^\gamma} g_{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{E}^\gamma \tag{5.3}$$

for all $\alpha = 0, \ldots 8$, setting $L_{(\rho)\mu} = \eta_{\mu\rho}$.

Now we want to include matter to the system. Since matter couples to the effective metric $G^{ab}$, the variation of the matter Lagrangian with respect to the geometry is given as usual in terms of the energy-momentum tensor $T_{ab}$ of matter,

$$\delta S_M = \int \sqrt{G} T_{ab} \delta G^{ab} = \int \sqrt{G} e^{-\sigma}\, T_{ab} \Pi^{ab,cd} \delta g_{cd}. \tag{5.4}$$

Here we note that the variation of the effective metric can be written as

$$\delta G^{ab} = e^{-\sigma}\delta\gamma^{ab} + \delta e^{-\sigma}\gamma^{ab} = e^{-\sigma}(\theta\delta g\theta)^{ab} - \tfrac{1}{2(n-1)}g^{cd}\delta g_{cd}G^{ab} = e^{-\sigma}\Pi^{ab,cd}\delta g_{cd},$$

where

$$\Pi^{ab,cd} = \theta^{ac}\theta^{db} - \tfrac{1}{2(n-1)}g^{ab}\gamma^{cd}.$$

Using the above form for $\delta g_{ab}$, this becomes

$$\delta S_M = -2\int \sqrt{\theta^{-1}}\,\mathcal{E}^\alpha\big(K_{(\alpha)ab}\Pi^{ab,cd}T_{cd} + J_{\alpha b}\Pi^{ab,cd}\partial_a T_{cd}\big) \tag{5.5}$$

using (3.54) and (3.57), assuming type A or C for simplicity and replacing $L_a \to J_a$ for the background. Therefore the presence of matter leads to perturbations of $\mathcal{E}^\alpha$ mediated by $J_\alpha \neq 0$. Non-derivative coupling to matter arises in the presence of extrinsic curvature $K_{(\alpha)ab} \neq 0$. This induces a dynamical rotation of $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^6$ along $M^4$, which in turn affects the effective geometry. This will be elaborated in more detail for the zero modes below.

## 5.2 Zero modes and and low-energy effective action

The matrix model action is invariant under the 10-dimensional Poincare group $SO(9,1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^{10}$. This symmetry implies that given a solution, we get a new, degenerate solution[9] by acting with some group element. As usual, this leads to massless Goldstone bosons, and it is plausible that these zero modes govern the low-energy or long distance physics of the perturbed solutions. We therefore study these zero modes and their geometrical significance in detail. For a related discussion focusing on the particle physics aspects see [23].

Consider first the $SO(6)$ symmetry

$$\delta_{\underline{\alpha}} x^i = (\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}})^i{}_j x^j\,, \qquad \lambda_{\underline{\alpha}} \in \mathfrak{so}(6) \tag{5.6}$$

which acts on $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^6$ and preserves the non-compact brane $\mathbb{R}^4$. The corresponding Goldstone bosons are obtained by making these transformations $x^\mu$- dependent,

$$\delta_{\underline{\alpha}} x^i = \Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(x)\,(\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}})^i{}_j x^j\,. \tag{5.7}$$

For sufficiently complex $\mathcal{K}$, they all describe different, non-trivial[10] deformations of $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^6$. Therefore this gives $\dim(\mathfrak{so}(6)) = 15$ independent Goldstone bosons on $\mathbb{R}^4$. Along with the remaining 4-dimensional zero modes due to the other symmetries, they should govern the low-energy physics. This is nothing but the usual low-energy effective field theory approach.

For the solutions under consideration, we can describe these symmetries and perturbations in terms of the variables $\varphi^\alpha$ introduced before. The torus solutions (3.22) can be viewed as

$$\varphi^\alpha: \quad T^2 \hookrightarrow S^5\,, \tag{5.8}$$

---

[9] This global rotation preserves the type of solution (type A,B,C) under consideration, since it simply rotates generators $\lambda_\alpha$.

[10] For type A, the rotation in 8, 9 direction is trivial. Note also that the tangential modes $\lambda_4, \lambda_5$ along $T^2 \subset S^5$ correspond to gauge transformations.

described by the local coordinates $\varphi^\alpha, \ \alpha = 4, ..., 8$ on $S^5 \subset \mathbb{R}^6$. The unperturbed solutions are embedded along $\varphi^4, \varphi^5$, which can be used as coordinates on $T^2$. Thus an infinitesimal rotation of the tori can be written as[11]

$$\delta_{\underline{\alpha}} x^i = (\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}})^i{}_j x^j = x^i(\varphi + \mathcal{E}^\beta_{\underline{\alpha}}) - x^i(\varphi) = \mathcal{E}^\beta_{\underline{\alpha}} \frac{\partial x^i}{\partial \varphi^\beta} \tag{5.9}$$

with infinitesimal $\mathcal{E}^\alpha_{\underline{\alpha}}(\varphi)$, for $\alpha = 4, .., 8$. Now we choose a basis of $\mathfrak{so}(6)$ as follows

$$\{\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}}\} = \{\lambda_4, \lambda_5, \lambda_6; \ \lambda_{\underline{\alpha}'}\} \tag{5.10}$$

such that the $\lambda_4, \lambda_5, \lambda_6$ are (in a suitable basis) mutually commuting $2 \times 2$-block-diagonal matrices[12] of $\mathfrak{so}(6)$, orthogonal (w.r.t the Killing metric) to the remaining block-off-diagonal matrices $\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}'}$. Then $\mathcal{E}^\beta_{\underline{\alpha}} = \delta^\beta_{\underline{\alpha}}$ for $\underline{\alpha} = 4, 5, (6)$ for the unperturbed solution, and the zero mode (5.7) can be written in terms of the original $\mathcal{E}^\alpha$ fields as

$$\mathcal{E}^\alpha(x^\mu, \xi^i) = \Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(x^\mu)\mathcal{E}^\alpha_{\underline{\alpha}}(x^\mu, \xi^i) \ . \tag{5.11}$$

Although we will not need the $\mathcal{E}^\alpha_{\underline{\alpha}}$ explicitly, it means that some of these zero modes correspond to non-trivial Kaluza-Klein modes on $\mathcal{K}$. Hence the apparently new degrees of freedom $\Lambda_{\underline{\alpha}}(x^\mu)$ simply capture certain higher KK modes of $\mathcal{E}^\alpha$, corresponding to $x^\mu$–dependent symmetry transformations of the rigid objects $\mathcal{K}$. In a more complete treatment, we should expand the most general perturbation $\mathcal{E}^\alpha(x^\mu, \xi^i)$ into harmonics on $\mathcal{K}$, obtain the equations of motion for these KK modes, and discard those who acquire a mass from the 4-dimensional point of view. This is a non-trivial but well-defined task, which requires to solve the general equations of motion elaborated in section 5.4. The present approach based on symmetries allows to short-cut this complex procedure in a simple and intuitive way.

There is an interesting alternative point of view. If these zero modes describe all relevant low-energy modes, then the low-energy effective action can be viewed as an action for a group-valued field on $\mathbb{R}^4$,

$$R(x^\mu) = \exp(\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(x^\mu)\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}}) : \quad M^4 \to \mathcal{G} \ . \tag{5.12}$$

This is the case if the action of $\mathcal{G}$ on the solution is free, which should hold quite generically for sufficiently complex compactifications. Otherwise, one has to replace $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ where $\mathcal{H}$ is the stabilizer group.

**Averaged currents.** We assume type A or C from now on. The general $\mathfrak{so}(6)$ currents can be written as follows

$$\begin{aligned} J_{(\underline{\alpha})a} &= H_{\underline{\alpha}\beta}\partial_a\varphi^\beta \\ H_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} &:= -\vec{x}\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}}\lambda_{\underline{\beta}}\vec{x} = \mathcal{E}^\alpha_{\underline{\alpha}}\, H_{\alpha\beta}\, \mathcal{E}^\beta_{\underline{\beta}} \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

where $H_{\alpha\beta} = g^{(S^5)}_{\alpha\beta}$ for $\alpha, \beta = 4, 5$, (and $\alpha = 6$ for type C) due to (3.25) in the above conventions. The average over $\mathcal{K}$ can be written in the form

$$\langle H_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} \rangle = -\mathrm{tr}\big(\Pi\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}}\lambda_{\underline{\beta}}\big) \tag{5.14}$$

---

[11] Although the coordinates $\varphi^\alpha$ are not globally defined on $T^2$, this is not expected to be a serious problem.

[12] For type A, the new $\lambda_6$ is different from the one used in the previous sections.

where $\Pi$ is defined in (B.16). We verify explicitly in appendix B that $\Pi$ commutes with the three commuting $U(1)$ generators $\lambda_{4,5,6}$. It follows that $\langle H_{\underline{\alpha}\beta}\rangle$ is invariant under these $U(1)$ subgroups for $\beta \in \{4,5,6\}$, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\langle H_{\underline{\alpha}\beta}\rangle &= 0, \quad \beta \in \{4,5,6\}, \quad \underline{\alpha} \notin \{4,5,6\} \\ \langle J_{(\underline{\alpha})a}\rangle &= \begin{cases} k_a^\beta g_{\beta\alpha}, & \underline{\alpha} \equiv \alpha \in \{4,5,(6)\} \\ 0, & \underline{\alpha} \notin \{4,5,(6)\} \end{cases}\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

where $\alpha = 6$ is included for type C. To proceed, we will expand the action to quadratic order in the $\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(x^\mu)$, and study the associated perturbations of the 4-dimensional geometry.

**Metric perturbations due to zero modes.** We determine the metric perturbations due to the above zero modes. Consider first the above $SO(6)$ modes. Similar as in (5.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\Lambda g_{ab}^{(\mathcal{K})} &= \partial_a \vec{x}\partial_b(\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(x)\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}}\vec{x}) + \partial_a(-\vec{x}\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(x)\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}})\partial_b\vec{x} \\ &= \partial_b\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(x)J_{(\underline{\alpha})a} + \partial_a\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(x)J_{(\underline{\alpha})b}\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

which vanishes for constant $\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}$ as it should. Here $J_{(\underline{\alpha})a}$ is the $SO(6)$ current (3.49). Note that the sum is now over all the $\mathfrak{so}(6)$ generators rather than just $\alpha = 4,...,8$, which is sometimes useful [11]. Similarly, the translational symmetries

$$X^A \ \to X^A + c^A \tag{5.17}$$

give rise to 10 Goldstone bosons $c^A(x^\mu)$. The corresponding metric perturbations are

$$\delta_c g_{ab} = \partial_a c_A \partial_b x^A + \partial_a x^A \partial_b c_A = \partial_a c_A J_b^A + J_a^A \partial_b c_A \tag{5.18}$$

where

$$J_b^A := \partial_b x^A\ . \tag{5.19}$$

However, the zero modes corresponding to internal translations $\mathbb{R}^6$ do not couple to matter since $\langle J^i\rangle = 0$.

Formally, analogous considerations apply to the full $SO(9,1)$ symmetry. However, they are not expected to lead to independent physical modes, since the currents corresponding to the breaking modes of $SO(9,1) \to SO(3,1) \times SO(6)$ always vanish upon averaging over $\mathcal{K}$; moreover they diverge at infinity (cf. [23]). Similarly, the $SO(3,1)$ modes are redundant with the translational modes $c^\mu$. This leaves only the $SO(6) \times \mathbb{R}^6$ modes discussed above. Nevertheless, it might be useful to keep track of the full $SO(9,1)$ symmetry if the embedding of the non-compact brane $M^4 \subset \mathbb{R}^{10}$ is non-trivial, as expected e.g. for cosmological solutions [24]. This will be pursued elsewhere.

**Radial mode $X^A \to \alpha X^A$.** If $S = 0$, then $X^A \to \alpha X^A$ is also a symmetry, with associated zero mode $\Lambda^{(R)}$. The corresponding metric perturbation is

$$\delta_R g_{ab}^{(\mathcal{K})} = 2\Lambda^{(R)} g_{ab} + \frac{1}{2}\partial_b\Lambda^{(R)}\partial_a r^2 + \frac{1}{2}\partial_a\Lambda^{(R)}\partial_b r^2 \tag{5.20}$$

This is interesting because it provides a non-derivative coupling to the energy-momentum tensor. Similarly, there might also be a symmetry $X^i \to \alpha X^i$ if $\Theta^{\alpha\beta} = 0$. However it seems likely that these radial modes are massive, and do not contribute to the low-energy physics. In particular, this happens in the presence of flux on $\mathcal{K}$ as explained in section 3.5.

**Coupling to matter.** The coupling of these zero modes to matter is obtained from (5.5),

$$\delta S_M = -2\int_{M^4}\sqrt{\theta^{-1}}\,\Lambda^{(\underline{\alpha})}\big(\langle K_{(\alpha)\mu\nu}\rangle\Pi^{\mu\nu,\mu'\nu'}T_{\mu'\nu'} + \langle J_{(\underline{\alpha})\nu}\rangle\Pi^{\mu\nu,\mu'\nu'}\partial_\mu T_{\mu'\nu'}\big) + \big(\underline{\alpha}\leftrightarrow A\big), \qquad (5.21)$$

where $K_{(A)\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu J_{(A)\nu}$. We assume here that matter responsible for the energy-momentum tensor is in the lowest KK mode, so that the energy-momentum tensor consists only of lowest KK modes and does not have any components along $\mathcal{K}$.

**Second order expansion and effective action.** To get the action expanded up to second order in the zero modes, we need

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^2_\Lambda\vec{x} &= \frac{1}{2}\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(x)\Lambda^{\underline{\beta}}(x)\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}}\lambda_{\underline{\beta}}\vec{x}\\
\delta^2_\Lambda g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{ab} &= \partial_a\big(-\,\vec{x}\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(x)\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}}\big)\partial_b\big(\Lambda^{\underline{\beta}}(x)\lambda_{\underline{\beta}}\vec{x}\big) + \frac{1}{2}\partial_a\vec{x}\partial_b\big(\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(x)\Lambda^{\underline{\beta}}(x)\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}}\lambda_{\underline{\beta}}\vec{x}\big) + \frac{1}{2}\partial_a\big(\vec{x}\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(x)\Lambda^{\underline{\beta}}(x)\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}}\lambda_{\underline{\beta}}\big)\partial_b\vec{x}\\
&= -\frac{1}{2}f_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}^{\ \ \underline{\gamma}}\big(J_{(\underline{\gamma})a}\partial_b\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}\Lambda^{\underline{\beta}} + J_{(\underline{\gamma})b}\partial_a\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}\Lambda^{\underline{\beta}}\big) + \partial_a\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}\partial_b\Lambda^{\underline{\beta}}\ H_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}
\end{aligned}$$

where $f_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}^{\ \ \underline{\gamma}}$ are the structure constants of $\mathfrak{so}(6)$. The mixed variations are

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^2_{\Lambda c}x^i &= \Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}})^i_j c^j\\
\delta^2_{\Lambda c}g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{ab} &= \partial_a c^i\partial_b\big(\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}})_{ij}x^j\big) - \partial_a\big(\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}x^i(\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}})_{ij}\big)\partial_b c^j + \partial_a x^i\partial_b\big(\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}})_{ij}c^j\big) - \partial_a\big(\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}c^i(\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}})_{ij}\big)\partial_b x^j\\
&= \partial_b\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}\big(\partial_a c^i(\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}})_{ij}x^j + \partial_a x^i(\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}})_{ij}c^j\big) + (a\leftrightarrow b)\ .
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the effective action for the zero modes expanded to second order is

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{YM} &= \int\sqrt{\theta^{-1}}\,\theta^{aa'}\theta^{bb'}\big(\delta g_{ab}\delta g_{a'b'} + 2g_{ab}\delta^2 g_{a'b'}\big)\\
&= \int\sqrt{\theta^{-1}}\,\Big(2\theta^{aa'}\theta^{bb'}(\partial_b\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}J_{(\underline{\alpha})a} + \partial_a\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}J_{(\underline{\alpha})b} + \partial_a c_A J^A_b + \partial_b c_A J^A_a)(\partial_{b'}\Lambda^{\underline{\beta}}J_{(\underline{\beta})a'} + \partial_{b'}c_B J^B_{a'})\\
&\quad - 2\gamma^{ab}f_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}^{\ \ \underline{\gamma}}J_{(\underline{\gamma})a}\partial_b\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}\Lambda^{\underline{\beta}} + 2\gamma^{ab}\partial_a\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}\partial_b\Lambda^{\underline{\beta}}\ H_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}\\
&\quad + 4\gamma^{ab}\partial_b\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}\big(\partial_a c^i(\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}})_{ij}x^j + \partial_a x^i(\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}})_{ij}c^j\big) + 2\gamma^{ab}\partial_a c^A\partial_b c_A\Big)\ . \qquad (5.22)
\end{aligned}$$

Now recall that the 4-dimensional Goldstone bosons $\Lambda^{(\alpha)}$ and $c^A$ are constant along $\mathcal{K}$. Therefore we can write this action using the averaging $\langle.\rangle$ over $\mathcal{K}$ introduced before (4.12). This simplifies using partial integration using $\langle J_{(\underline{\alpha})b}J_{(\underline{\beta})a}\rangle = const$ and $\langle x^i\rangle = 0$, and

$$S_{YM} = 2\int d^4x\sqrt{\theta^{-1}}\,\Big(\langle f\,f\rangle - \gamma^{ab}f_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}^{\ \ \underline{\gamma}}\langle J_{(\underline{\gamma})a}\rangle\partial_b\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}\Lambda^{\underline{\beta}} + \gamma^{ab}\partial_a\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}\partial_b\Lambda^{\underline{\beta}}\ \langle H_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}\rangle + \gamma^{ab}\partial_a c^A\partial_b c_A\Big) \qquad (5.23)$$

where

$$f(\Lambda,c) = \theta^{\mu\nu}(\partial_\mu\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(x)J_{(\underline{\alpha})\nu} + \partial_\mu c^A(x)J_{(A)\nu})\ . \qquad (5.24)$$

We note that $\langle H_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}\rangle$ is non-degenerate for type C due to (5.14) and (B.16), and is invariant under the 3 commuting $U(1)$ generators. Pretending that all these modes are independent[13], we obtain the equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned} \langle H_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}\rangle e^{\sigma}\Box_G\Lambda^{\underline{\beta}} + \theta^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\langle J_{(\underline{\alpha})\nu} f\rangle - \gamma^{\mu\nu} f_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}{}^{\underline{\gamma}}\langle J_{(\underline{\gamma})\mu}\rangle\ \partial_\nu\Lambda^{\underline{\beta}} &= \langle J_{(\underline{\alpha})\mu}\rangle\partial_\nu\tilde{T}^{\mu\nu} \\ e^{\sigma}\Box_G c^A + \theta^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\langle J^A_\nu f\rangle &= \langle J^A_\mu\rangle\partial_\nu\tilde{T}^{\mu\nu} \end{aligned} \tag{5.25}$$

where

$$\tilde{T}^{\mu\nu} = \theta^{\mu\mu'}\theta^{\nu\nu'}T_{\mu\nu} \tag{5.26}$$

A similar structure was obtained in [10]. It follows from the explicit form (5.15) of $\langle J_{(\underline{\alpha})}\rangle$ and $\langle \mathcal{H}_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}\rangle$ that matter $T_{\mu\nu}$ induces perturbations only for the $\Lambda^{4,5,6}$ and the $c^\mu$ modes. In vacuum, the zero modes will be shown to imply Ricci-flat perturbations. This is perfectly consistent with gravity in vacuum, however the appropriate coupling to matter must arise in a different way. Some possible mechanisms will briefly be discussed below.

It should be clear that the results of this section are not restricted to the specific compactifications under considerations but apply more generally.

## 5.3 Linearized curvature tensor

In this section we compute the linearized Ricci or Einstein tensor due to the above zero modes, for the effective metric $G^{ab}$ and its 4-dimensional reduction $G^{\mu\nu}$. We only consider the case of type A or type C unperturbed background, which is intrinsically flat. We will work in Darboux coordinates, which are in metric compatible with the background for type A and C, so that $\bar{\nabla} \equiv \partial$. The linearized perturbation of the effective metric is given by

$$h^{ab} = \delta G^{ab} = e^{-\sigma}\delta\gamma^{ab} - \bar{G}^{ab}\delta\sigma\ , \qquad \delta\sigma\ = -\frac{1}{2}\bar{G}_{ab}h^{ab} \tag{5.27}$$

using (5.3). For the zero modes, we get after averaging

$$(\delta_\Lambda + \delta_c)\langle\gamma^{ab}\rangle = \theta^{aa'}\theta^{bb'}\Big(\partial_{b'}\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}(x)\langle J_{(\underline{\alpha})a'}\rangle + \partial_{b'}c^A\langle J_{A,a'}\rangle\Big) + (a \leftrightarrow b). \tag{5.28}$$

The linearized Ricci tensor on a flat background is given by [25]

$$\begin{aligned} \delta R^{ab} &= \frac{1}{2}\bar{\Box}_G h^{ab} + \frac{1}{2}\partial^a\delta\Gamma^b + \frac{1}{2}\partial^b\delta\Gamma^a\ , \\ -\delta\Gamma^a &= \partial_b h^{ab} - \frac{1}{2}\partial^a(\bar{G}_{ab}h^{ab}) = \delta(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|G|}}\partial_b(\sqrt{|G|}G^{ab})) = \delta(e^{-\sigma}\partial_b\gamma^{ab})\ . \end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

Therefore the linearized Einstein tensor is

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mathcal{G}^{ab} &= \delta R^{ab} - \frac{1}{2}\bar{G}^{ab}\delta R \\ &= \frac{1}{2}e^{-\sigma}\bar{\Box}_G\delta\gamma^{ab} + \frac{1}{2}\partial^a\delta\Gamma^b + \frac{1}{2}\partial^b\delta\Gamma^a - \frac{1}{2}\bar{G}^{ab}\partial_c\delta\Gamma^c \end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

---

[13] Apart from the pure gauge modes, which could be fixed by setting $\langle f\rangle = 0$. We assume here that the modes are constant along $\mathcal{K}$. If the modes are not independent then there might be additional solutions.

on a flat background, in the present Darboux coordinates. For the zero modes (and type A,C), we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\sigma}\,(\delta_\Lambda + \delta_c)\langle\Gamma^a\rangle &= \theta^{aa'}\theta^{bb'}\partial_b\Big(\partial_{b'}\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}\langle J_{(\underline{\alpha})a'}\rangle + \partial_{a'}\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}\langle J_{(\underline{\alpha})b'}\rangle + \partial_{b'}c^A\langle J_{A,a'}\rangle + \partial_{a'}c^A\langle J_{A,b'}\rangle\Big) \\ &= \theta^{aa'}\partial_{a'}\langle f\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{5.31}$$

since $\langle J_{(\underline{\alpha})b}\rangle = const.$ Now we use the equations of motion (5.25) and (5.13), which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Box}_G\langle\delta_\Lambda\gamma^{ab}\rangle &= \theta^{aa'}\theta^{bb'}\partial_{b'}\bar{\Box}_G\Lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}\langle H_{\underline{\alpha}\beta}\rangle k^{\beta}_{a'} \;+ (a\leftrightarrow b) \\ &= e^{-\sigma}\theta^{aa'}\theta^{bb'}\Big( - k^{\beta}_{a'}\theta^{cc'}\partial_{b'}\partial_c\langle J_{(\beta)c'}f\rangle + f_{\alpha\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\gamma}}\gamma^{cd}k^{\alpha}_{a'}\langle J_{(\underline{\gamma})d}\rangle\partial_{b'}\partial_c\Lambda^{\underline{\beta}} \\ &\qquad + \langle J_{(\alpha)d}\rangle k^{\alpha}_{a'}\partial_{b'}\partial_c\tilde{T}^{dc}\Big) + (a\leftrightarrow b) \\ &= e^{-\sigma}\theta^{bb'}\Big( - \partial_{b'}\gamma^{ac}_{(\mathcal{K})}\partial_c\langle f\rangle + f_{\alpha\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\gamma}}\theta^{aa'}\gamma^{cd}k^{\alpha}_{a'}\langle J_{(\underline{\gamma})d}\rangle\partial_{b'}\partial_c\Lambda^{\underline{\beta}} \;+ \theta^{aa'}g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{da'}\partial_{b'}\partial_c\tilde{T}^{dc}\Big) + (a\leftrightarrow b) \\ \bar{\Box}_G\langle\delta_c\gamma^{ab}\rangle &= \theta^{aa'}\theta^{bb'}\partial_{b'}\bar{\Box}_G c^A\langle J_{(A)a'}\rangle \;+ (a\leftrightarrow b) \\ &= e^{-\sigma}\theta^{aa'}\theta^{bb'}\Big( - \langle J^A_{a'}\rangle\theta^{cc'}\partial_{b'}\partial_c\langle J_{(A)c'}f\rangle + \langle J^A_{a'}\rangle\langle J_{(A)d}\rangle\partial_{b'}\partial_c\tilde{T}^{dc}\Big) + (a\leftrightarrow b) \\ &= e^{-\sigma}\theta^{bb'}\Big( - \gamma^{ac}_{(4D)}\partial_{b'}\partial_c\langle f\rangle + \theta^{aa'}g^{(4D)}_{a'd}\partial_{b'}\partial_c\tilde{T}^{dc}\Big) + (a\leftrightarrow b) \end{aligned} \tag{5.32}$$

since $k^{\alpha}_a J_{(\alpha)b} = g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{ab}$ is constant for type A and C, where $\gamma^{ab}_{(\mathcal{K})} = \theta^{aa'}\theta^{bb'}g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{a'b'}$. Now the $f_{\alpha\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\gamma}}$ term drops out using (5.15), since the $\alpha = 4,5,6$ are mutually commuting $U(1)$'s. Noting that the $\langle f\rangle$ terms cancel, we obtain the linearized Einstein tensor

$$\delta\mathcal{G}^{\mu\nu}_{(4D)} = \frac{1}{2}e^{-2\sigma}\theta^{\nu\nu'}\theta^{\mu\mu'}g_{\mu'\delta}\partial_{\nu'}\partial_\gamma\tilde{T}^{\delta\gamma} + (\mu\leftrightarrow\nu)\;. \tag{5.33}$$

In particular, the Einstein tensor due to the zero modes vanishes wherever the energy-momentum tensor vanishes. For the $c^\mu$ modes this generalizes an observation by Rivelles [7]. This result is not restricted to the particular compactifications under consideration here, but apply for more general compactifications. Here we wrote the Einstein tensor for the reduced effective metric $G^{\mu\nu}_{(4D)}$ (4.13), which is obtained immediately from the above computation by simply restricting the indices to $\mu,\nu = 0,...,3$ and replacing the 6-dimensional $\bar{\Box}_G$ by the 4-dimensional version $\bar{\Box}^{4D}_G$. This is correct since $\delta\sigma_{4D} = \delta\sigma$ for the zero modes.

To understand better the response to matter, consider a perturbation $T_{\mu\nu}$ localized in some compact region. This induces a perturbation in $\Lambda^\alpha$ and $c^A$ similar to the electromagnetic potential of a dipole with strength $\sim T_{\mu\nu}$, which certainly does not produce the appropriate gravitational metric. However if $\mathcal{M}^4 \subset \mathbb{R}^{10}$ has a non-trivial embedding such that $\nabla\langle J^{(\alpha,A)}\rangle \neq 0$, some non-derivative coupling to $T_{\mu\nu}$ would arise, leading to gravity-like perturbations of the Ricci tensor, cf. [9]. Such backgrounds arise naturally e.g. for cosmological solution [24] or in the mass–deformed matrix model where $\mathcal{M}^4 \subset dS^9 \subset \mathbb{R}^{10}$. More generally, a non-trivial background of massless modes should also lead to such an effect, analogous to [10]. These issues must be studied in more detail elsewhere. In any case, Ricci-flat metric perturbations in vacuum as found above are certainly an essential and encouraging ingredient, which support the idea to obtain gravity on branes in the uncompactified matrix model.

## 5.4 Perturbations and equations of motion

Finally we provide the full equations of motion for general brane configurations $\mathcal{M}^6 \subset \mathbb{R}^4 \times S^5$, parametrized[14] in terms of the above variables. To have a compact notation, we define $\varphi^\alpha = x^\alpha$ for $\alpha = 0, \ldots, 3$, while $\varphi^\alpha$ is defined as in (3.24) for $\alpha = 4, \ldots, 8$. We also set

$$\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta} = g_{\alpha\beta} + \eta^{(4D)}_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{5.34}$$

Here $\eta^{(4D)}$ is the $4D$ Minkowski tensor, i.e., it vanishes if one of the indices is $\geq 4$. Now we derive the equation of motion in the perturbed case by variation w.r.t. $\varphi^\alpha$, $\alpha = 0, \ldots, 8$. The basic equation is

$$\delta g_{ab} = (\partial_a \delta\varphi^\alpha \partial_b \varphi^\beta + \partial_b \delta\varphi^\alpha \partial_a \varphi^\beta)\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta} + \partial_a \varphi^\alpha \partial_b \varphi^\beta \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\varphi^\gamma} g_{\alpha\beta} \delta\varphi^\gamma \tag{5.35}$$

For the Yang-Mills Lagrangian (2.13) we obtain the first order variation

$$\delta S_{YM} = 2 \int \sqrt{\theta^{-1}} \gamma^{ab} \delta g_{ab} dx. \tag{5.36}$$

In the absence of matter, this leads to the equation of motion

$$4\partial_a (\partial_b \varphi^\beta \tilde{g}_{\beta\alpha} \gamma^{ab}) - 2\partial_a \varphi^\gamma \partial_b \varphi^\delta \gamma^{ab} \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\varphi^\alpha} g_{\gamma\delta} = 0, \tag{5.37}$$

which for $\alpha = 7, 8$ (and $\alpha = 6$ except for type C) reduces to the current conservation law (3.56).

Proceeding as in Section 5.1, one sees that in the presence of matter, the r.h.s. of (5.37) is replaced by

$$\sqrt{|\theta|} \left[ -2\partial_a \left( \partial_b \varphi^\beta \tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta} e^{-\sigma} \sqrt{G} \Pi^{ab,cd} T_{cd} \right) + \partial_a \varphi^\gamma \partial_b \varphi^\delta \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\varphi^\alpha} g_{\gamma\delta} e^{-\sigma} \sqrt{G} \Pi^{ab,cd} T_{cd} \right].$$

Generalizing (3.53) to

$$\tilde{L}_{\alpha a} = \partial_a \varphi^\beta \tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{5.38}$$

where now $\alpha = 0, \ldots, 8$, and using that we are in Darboux coordinates, we obtain

$$4\partial_a (\tilde{L}_{\alpha b} \gamma^{ab}) - 2\partial_a \varphi^\gamma \partial_b \varphi^\delta \gamma^{ab} \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\varphi^\alpha} g_{\gamma\delta} = -2\partial_a \left( \tilde{L}_{\alpha b} \Pi^{ab,cd} T_{cd} \right) + \partial_a \varphi^\gamma \partial_b \varphi^\delta \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\varphi^\alpha} g_{\gamma\delta} \Pi^{ab,cd} T_{cd}. \tag{5.39}$$

Let us now assume that (5.37) has been solved for $\mathcal{E} = 0$. At first order in $\mathcal{E}$ and dropping the matter contributions, this equation reads

$$\begin{aligned}
4\partial_a \Big[ \partial_b \mathcal{E}^\beta \tilde{g}_{\beta\alpha} \gamma^{ab} + k^\beta_b \mathcal{E}^\gamma \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\varphi^\gamma} g_{\beta\alpha} \gamma^{ab} + \tilde{L}_{\alpha b} \theta^{aa'} \Big( \tilde{L}_{\delta a'} \partial_{b'} \mathcal{E}^\delta + \tilde{L}_{\delta b'} \partial_{a'} \mathcal{E}^\delta + k^\delta_{a'} k^\varepsilon_{b'} \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\varphi^\gamma} g_{\delta\varepsilon} \mathcal{E}^\gamma \Big) \theta^{b'b} \Big] \\
- 2(k^\gamma_a \partial_b \mathcal{E}^\delta + \partial_a \mathcal{E}^\gamma k^\delta_b) \gamma^{ab} \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\varphi^\alpha} g_{\gamma\delta} - 2k^\gamma_a k^\delta_b \gamma^{ab} \tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\varphi^\alpha \partial\varphi^\beta} g_{\gamma\delta} \mathcal{E}^\beta \\
- 2k^\gamma_a k^\delta_b \theta^{aa'} \Big( \tilde{L}_{\delta a'} \partial_{b'} \mathcal{E}^\delta + \tilde{L}_{\delta b'} \partial_{a'} \mathcal{E}^\delta + k^\delta_{a'} k^\varepsilon_{b'} \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\varphi^\gamma} g_{\delta\varepsilon} \mathcal{E}^\gamma \Big) \theta^{b'b} \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\varphi^\alpha} g_{\gamma\delta} = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.40}$$

---

[14] There is a subtlety since $\det g_{\alpha\beta}$ vanishes at isolated points on $\mathcal{K}$. This simply indicates the limitations of the spherical coordinates $\varphi^\alpha$ on $S^5$.

where now $\tilde{L}_{\alpha a} = k_a^\beta g_{\alpha\beta} + \eta^{(4D)}_{\alpha a}$, as we perturb around $\mathcal{E} = 0$. For type A and C, this reduces to

$$4\partial_a \left[\partial_b \mathcal{E}^\beta \tilde{g}_{\beta\alpha}\gamma^{ab} + k_b^\beta \mathcal{E}^\gamma \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\varphi^\gamma} g_{\beta\alpha}\gamma^{ab} + \tilde{L}_{\alpha b}\theta^{aa'}\left(\tilde{L}_{\delta a'}\partial_{b'}\mathcal{E}^\delta + \tilde{L}_{\alpha b'}\partial_{a'}\mathcal{E}^\delta\right)\theta^{b'b}\right] - 2(k_a^\gamma \partial_b \mathcal{E}^\delta + \partial_a \mathcal{E}^\gamma k_b^\delta)\gamma^{ab}\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\varphi^\alpha} g_{\gamma\delta} = 0. \quad (5.41)$$

This equation of motion allows to go beyond the above zero modes, and to systematically cover all higher KK modes.

# 6 Conclusions and outlook

We have studied in detail new brane solutions of the IKKT model with geometry $\mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{10}$, with compact extra dimensions stabilized by angular momentum. It turns out that $\mathcal{K}$ and its moduli contribute to the effective 4-dimensional metric, mediated by the non-commutative structure of the brane. We focused on the massless modes originating from global symmetries of the model. Our main result is that the metric contributions due to these zero modes lead to Ricci flat curvature perturbations in vacuum, consistent with the picture of emergent gravity on the brane. This result is expected to be quite generic, independent of the specifics of the compact space $\mathcal{K}$. On the other hand, the non-derivative coupling to the energy-momentum tensor required for gravity – which can arise in the presence of extrinsic curvature [9–11] – turns out to cancel for the backgrounds under consideration. The reason seems to be that the radial moduli are stabilized by the non-vanishing flux on $\mathcal{K}$. This suggests that other, less rigid types of backgrounds should be considered in oder to obtain physical gravity on the brane; this will be pursued elsewhere.

The present solutions are also of interest as building blocks for reducible, block-diagonal solutions of the matrix model, which may lead to gauge theories on the brane with non-simple gauge groups. In suitable configurations, this might allow to obtain (extensions of) the standard model, cf. [16, 20]. In particular, it would be interesting to study fermions on such backgrounds, and to determine whether chiral zero modes arise due to the presence of flux on $\mathcal{K}$. Such chiral zero modes do not arise for static compactifications e.g. with fuzzy spheres [21], but they might arise here due to the extra rotation of the new solutions. Moreover, bound states of similar compactifications may enlarge the class of solutions, and stabilize them if required. All these are topics for further work.

**Acknowledgments.** H.S. would like to thank the high energy group of CUNY for hospitality and support for a visiting position, where this work was initiated. The work of A.P. is supported by National Science Foundation under grant PHY-1213380 and by a PSC-CUNY grant. The work of H.S. and J.Z. is supported by the Austrian Fonds für Wissenschaft und Forschung under grant P24713.

# A Conserved currents

## A.1 The general setup

We first want to discuss the determination of currents in an abstract setting, following [22]. The matrix model is characterized by a set of variables $\mathcal{C} = \{Z_i \in \mathcal{A}\}_{i \in I}$ taking values in the $*$-algebra $\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{Mat}(N \times N, \mathbb{C})$ and a map $L : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{B}$, called the *Lagrangian*. Here, $\mathcal{B}$ denotes the subset of hermitean elements of $\mathcal{A}$. We assume that the Lagrangian is a polynomial in the $Z_i$. The elements $Z_i$ may carry a supplementary Grassmann coordinate. The *action* is given by the trace over the Lagrangian. In the particular case of the IKKT model, $\{Z_i\} = \{X^A, \Psi_\alpha\}$. An infinitesimal variation of $L$ by $Z_i \to Z_i + \delta Z_i$ can be written as

$$\delta L = \sum_{ia} \delta L_{ia}^{(1)} \delta Z_i \delta L_{ia}^{(2)}. \tag{A.1}$$

This leads to the equations of motion

$$\sum_a (-1)^{\pi_{ia}} \delta L_{ia}^{(2)} \delta L_{ia}^{(1)} = 0. \tag{A.2}$$

Here $\pi_{ia}$ is determined by the Grassmann parity of $\delta L_{ia}^{(k)}$ and $\delta Z_i$.

Let us now discuss symmetries. We employ the following definition:

**Definition** A *continuous symmetry* consist of maps

$$\alpha_i : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{A}, \qquad \beta : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A},$$

which are differentiable in the first variable and fulfill

$$\alpha_i(0)(Z) = Z_i, \qquad \beta(0)(A) = A,$$

and

$$\beta(t)\left(L[\alpha_i(t)(Z)]\right) = L[Z_i]$$

for all $\{Z_i\} \in \mathcal{C}$ and all $t$. Furthermore, we require that $\beta(t)$ is a $*$-homomorphism.

This definition is a reflection of the fact that in ordinary field theory, one requires that the action of the symmetry on the Lagrangian can be absorbed in an action on the Lagrangian. For example, a translation of the fields $\phi$ can be absorbed in an opposite translation of $L[\phi]$.

Differentiation w.r.t. $t$ at $t = 0$ yields

$$\dot\beta L[Z] + \sum_{ia} \delta L_{ia}^{(1)} \dot\alpha_i(Z) \delta L_{ia}^{(2)} = 0. \tag{A.3}$$

Using the equation of motion, we obtain that

$$\dot\beta L[Z] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ia} \left( \{\delta L_{ia}^{(1)}, \dot\alpha_i(Z) \delta L_{ia}^{(2)}\}_\pm + \{\delta L_{ia}^{(1)} \dot\alpha_i(Z), \delta L_{ia}^{(2)}\}_\pm \right) = 0 \tag{A.4}$$

on-shell. Here $\{\cdot,\cdot\}_\pm$ denotes the commutator or anti-commutator, depending on the Grassmann parity. Here we chose a symmetric way of commuting the $\delta L_{ia}^{(k)}$.[15] This is the *conservation law* corresponding to the symmetry. In a semi-classical limit, where (anti-) commutators are replaced by the Poisson bracket, we may use $\theta^{ab}\partial_a A \partial_b B = \sqrt{|\theta|}\partial_a(\sqrt{|\theta|^{-1}}\theta^{ab} A \partial_b B)$ to obtain a conserved current.

In order to determine the conservation laws for arbitrary symmetries, we give the $\delta L_{ia}^{(k)}$ for the IKKT model, i.e., for the Lagrangian (2.1):

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta L_{A1}^{(1)} &= \tfrac{1}{2}, & \delta L_{A1}^{(2)} &= X^B[X_A, X_B], \\
\delta L_{A2}^{(1)} &= -\tfrac{1}{2}X^B, & \delta L_{A2}^{(2)} &= [X_A, X_B], \\
\delta L_{A3}^{(1)} &= \tfrac{1}{2}[X_A, X_B], & \delta L_{A3}^{(2)} &= X^B, \\
\delta L_{A4}^{(1)} &= -\tfrac{1}{2}[X_A, X_B]X^B, & \delta L_{A4}^{(2)} &= 1, \\
\delta L_{A5}^{(1)} &= \tfrac{1}{2}\tilde{\gamma}_A^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\alpha, & \delta L_{A5}^{(2)} &= \psi_\beta, \\
\delta L_{A6}^{(1)} &= -\tfrac{1}{2}\tilde{\gamma}_A^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\alpha\psi_\beta, & \delta L_{A6}^{(2)} &= 1, \\
\delta L_{\alpha1}^{(1)} &= \tfrac{1}{2}, & \delta L_{\alpha1}^{(2)} &= \tilde{\gamma}_A^{\alpha\beta}[X^A, \psi_\beta], \\
\delta L_{\alpha2}^{(1)} &= -\tfrac{1}{2}\tilde{\gamma}_A^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta, & \delta L_{\alpha2}^{(2)} &= X^A, \\
\delta L_{\alpha3}^{(1)} &= \tfrac{1}{2}\tilde{\gamma}_A^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta X^A, & \delta L_{\alpha3}^{(2)} &= 1.
\end{aligned}$$

## A.2 The Lorentz current

The IKKT action is invariant under the Lorentz symmetry

$$\delta\Psi_\alpha = \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha^\beta \Psi_\beta, \qquad \delta X^A = \lambda_B^A X^B,$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}$ is a generator of the connected component $\mathrm{Spin}_0(9,1)$ of the $\mathrm{Spin}(9,1)$ group, and $\lambda$ the corresponding generator of the connected component $SO_0(9,1)$ of the Lorentz group. This follows from the $\gamma$ matrix transformation law

$$\tilde{\lambda}_\beta^\alpha \tilde{\gamma}_A^{\beta\gamma} + \tilde{\gamma}_A^{\alpha\beta}\tilde{\lambda}_\beta^\gamma + \tilde{\gamma}_B^{\alpha\gamma}\lambda_A^B = 0. \tag{A.5}$$

This symmetry is internal in the sense that $\dot{\beta} = 0$. For the corresponding conservation law, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = {} & \tfrac{1}{2}\lambda_C^A[X_B, \{X^C, [X_A, X^B]\}] \\
& - \tfrac{1}{4}\lambda_C^A \left(\tilde{\gamma}_A^{\alpha\beta}\{\Psi_\alpha, X^C\Psi_\beta\} + \tilde{\gamma}_A^{\alpha\beta}\{\Psi_\alpha X^C, \Psi_\beta\} - \tilde{\gamma}_A^{\alpha\beta}[\Psi_\alpha\Psi_\beta, X^C]\right) \\
& + \tfrac{1}{4}\tilde{\lambda}_\alpha^\gamma\tilde{\gamma}_A^{\alpha\beta}\left(-\{\Psi_\gamma, [X^A, \Psi_\beta]\} + \{\Psi_\beta, \Psi_\gamma X^A\} + [\Psi_\beta\Psi_\gamma, X^A] - \{\Psi_\beta X^A, \Psi_\gamma\}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we already simplified the bosonic part. Replacing (anti-) commutators by Poisson brackets, we obtain the following conservation law in the semi-classical limit:

$$\partial_a\left[\sqrt{|\theta|^{-1}}\theta^{ab}\left(\lambda_C^A g_{bd} x^C \theta^{cd}\partial_c x_A - \tfrac{i}{2}\lambda_C^A\tilde{\gamma}_A^{\alpha\beta}X^C\psi_\alpha\partial_b\psi_\beta + \tfrac{i}{2}\tilde{\lambda}_\alpha^\gamma\tilde{\gamma}_A^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta\psi_\gamma\partial_b x^A\right)\right] = 0.$$

---

[15] Choosing a different commutation procedure leads to a different form of conservation law. However, the difference of two such conservation laws is an identity.

Dropping the fermionic part, the semi-classical conservation law is hence

$$0 = \partial_a(\sqrt{|\theta|^{-1}}\gamma^{ab}\lambda^A_C x^C \partial_b x_A) = \partial_a(\sqrt{-|G|}G^{ab}J_b)$$

with

$$J_b = \lambda^A_C x^C \partial_b x^A. \tag{A.6}$$

### A.3 The energy-momentum tensor

Using our procedure, one may also compute the energy-momentum tensor. For an arbitrary hermitean $\varepsilon$, we have the symmetry $\delta_\varepsilon Z_i = i[\varepsilon, Z_i]$. It leads to $\delta_\varepsilon L = i[\varepsilon, L]$, so this is a symmetry in our sense. For the conservation law (A.4), we compute,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = -\tfrac{i}{2}[X_B, \{[\varepsilon, X_A], [X^A, X^B]\}] - \tfrac{i}{2}\tilde{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}_A \left(\{\Psi_\alpha, [X^A, \varepsilon]\Psi_\beta\} + [X^A, \Psi_\alpha[\Psi_\beta, \varepsilon]]\right) \\ - \tfrac{i}{4}[\varepsilon, [X^A, X^B][X_A, X_B] + 2\tilde{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}_A \Psi_\alpha [X^A, \Psi_\beta]] \end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

For $\varepsilon = X^C$, we can write this as

$$[X_B, T^{BC}] = -\tfrac{i}{2}\tilde{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}_A \{\Psi_\alpha, [X^A, X^C]\Psi_\beta\} \tag{A.8}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} T^{BC} = \tfrac{i}{2}\{[X^C, X_A], [X^A, X^B]\} + \tfrac{i}{2}\eta^{BA}\tilde{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}_A \Psi_\alpha[\Psi_\beta, X^C] \\ + \tfrac{i}{4}\eta^{BC}\left([X^A, X^B][X_A, X_B] + 2\tilde{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}_A \Psi_\alpha[X^A, \Psi_\beta]\right). \end{aligned}$$

In the semi-classical limit, the r.h.s. of (A.8) vanishes, and we obtain the usual conservation law.

## B Explicit examples.

### B.1 Type A solutions.

The generators $\lambda_\alpha \in \mathfrak{so}(6)$ in (3.23). may be chosen as

$$\lambda^{(A)}_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{1}_2 & 0 \\ -\mathbb{1}_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda^{(A)}_5 = \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{B.1}$$

along with

$$\lambda^{(A)}_6 = \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ 0 & \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda^{(A)}_7 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda^{(A)}_8 = \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{B.2}$$

corresponding to (3.18), where $i \cong \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ in complex notation. These are clearly two commuting sets of matrices and satisfy $-\lambda_4^2 + \lambda_5^2 = 0$. We use $z_0 = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ and obtain

$$g_{\alpha\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \cos^2\varphi^4 & 0 & \cos^2\varphi^4 \\ 0 & \cos^2\varphi^4 & \cos^2\varphi^4 + \cos^2\varphi^5 \sin^2\varphi^4 & 0 & \cos^2\varphi^4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sin^2\varphi^4 \sin^2\varphi^5 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos^2\varphi^4 & \cos^2\varphi^4 & 0 & \cos^2\varphi^4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let us give explicit examples of solutions of (3.39). For simplicity, we choose the standard symplectic form (3.15) with $\theta^{01} = \theta^{23} = \xi$. Furthermore, we assume $r = 1$ and $p = 1$ in (3.39). A solution with $\Theta \neq 0$ is then given by

$$k^{(4)} = (1, \sqrt{3}, 0, 0, 1, 0), \qquad k^{(5)} = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1).$$

Straightforward calculations show that the induced and effective metrics are constant, and the effective 4-dimensional metric $\gamma^{\mu\nu}$ (3.48) has Minkowski signature. One also checks that

$$\eta^{(4)}_{\mu\nu} \theta^{\mu\mu'} \theta^{\nu\nu'} g^{(\mathcal{K})}_{\mu\nu} < 0, \tag{B.3}$$

which is important for the stabilization of the radius at a nonzero value, cf. Section 3.5.

## B.2 Type B solutions.

For the generators, we may choose

$$\lambda_4^{(B)} = 5 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{1}_2 & 0 \\ -\mathbb{1}_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & i \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_5^{(B)} = 4 \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \end{pmatrix} \tag{B.4}$$

along with

$$\lambda_6^{(B)} = 3 \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbb{1}_2 \\ 0 & -\mathbb{1}_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_7^{(B)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \\ 0 & \left(\begin{smallmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_8^{(B)} = \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{B.5}$$

which are appropriately commuting and satisfy $-\lambda_4^2 + \lambda_5^2 + \lambda_6^2 = 0$. With $v_0 = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$, we obtain

$$g_{\alpha\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} 25 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 16 & 12\cos^2 5\varphi^4 & 0 & 4\cos^2 5\varphi^4 \\ 0 & 12\cos^2 5\varphi^4 & 9 & 3\cos 8\varphi^5 \sin^2 5\varphi^4 & 3\cos^2 5\varphi^4 \\ 0 & 0 & 3\cos 8\varphi^5 \sin^2 5\varphi^4 & \sin^2\varphi^5 & 0 \\ 0 & 4\cos^2 5\varphi^4 & 3\cos^2 5\varphi^4 & 0 & \cos^2 5\varphi^4 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{B.6}$$

For the momenta, we make an ansatz

$$\begin{aligned} k^{(4)} &= (0, k_1^{(4)}, 0, 0, 1, 0) \\ k^{(5)} &= (k_0^{(5)}, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1) \\ k^{(6)} &= (0, 0, k_2^{(6)}, 0, 0, 0)\ . \end{aligned} \tag{B.7}$$

Then the condition $\Theta^{\alpha\beta} = 0$ reduces to

$$k_1^{(4)} k_0^{(5)} \theta^{01} = \xi, \tag{B.8}$$

and the different $k^{(\alpha)}$ are automatically orthogonal. The orthogonality condition becomes $\gamma_{4D}^{\mu\nu} k_\mu^{(\alpha)} k_\nu^{(\beta)} + \xi^2 \mathrm{diag}(1,1,0) = p^2 \mathrm{diag}(-1,1,1)$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
(k_1^{(4)})^2 (\theta^{01})^2 &= p^2 + \xi^2 \\
(k_0^{(5)})^2 (\theta^{01})^2 &= p^2 - \xi^2 \\
(k_2^{(6)})^2 (\theta^{23})^2 &= p^2
\end{aligned} \tag{B.9}$$

The second together with (B.8) gives

$$(k_1^{(4)})^2 - (k_0^{(5)})^2 = (k_1^{(4)})^2 - (k_1^{(4)})^{-2} \frac{\xi^2}{(\theta^{01})^2} = 2 \frac{\xi^2}{(\theta^{01})^2} \tag{B.10}$$

hence

$$(k_1^{(4)})^2 = \frac{\xi^2}{(\theta^{01})^2} + \sqrt{\frac{\xi^4}{(\theta^{01})^4} + \frac{\xi^2}{(\theta^{01})^2}}, \tag{B.11}$$

and subsequently $k_0^{(5)}$ and $p^2$ are determined by (B.9). Then the last equation can always be solved for $k_2^{(6)}$. The effective 4-dimensional metric is given by

$$\gamma_{(4D)}^{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} (\theta^{01})^2 + (k_0^{(5)})^2 g_{55}^{(S^5)} & 0 & k_0^{(5)} k_2^{(6)} g_{46}^{(S^5)} & 0 \\ 0 & -(\theta^{01})^2 + (k_1^{(4)})^2 g_{44}^{(S^5)} & 0 & 0 \\ k_0^{(5)} k_2^{(6)} g_{46}^{(S^5)}(\varphi^4) & 0 & (\theta^{23})^2 + (k_2^{(6)})^2 g_{66}^{(S^5)} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & (\theta^{23})^2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{B.12}$$

This has Minkowski signature provided

$$(\theta^{01})^2 > (k_1^{(4)})^2 g_{44}^{(S^5)} \tag{B.13}$$

which is satisfied for suitable parameters $\theta^{01}, r, \xi$, in view of (B.11). Therefore there is indeed a non-empty moduli space of type B solutions with the desired Minkowski metric.

## B.3 Type C solutions.

Here we may choose the generators $\lambda_\alpha$ as

$$\lambda_4^{(C)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{1}_2 & 0 \\ -\mathbb{1}_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & i \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_5^{(C)} = \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_6^{(C)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & i \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B.14}$$

and

$$\lambda_7^{(C)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_8^{(C)} = \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{B.15}$$

Here $\lambda_4, \lambda_5, \lambda_6$ resp. $\lambda_7, \lambda_8$ are mutually commuting. We choose $z_0 = (1,0,0,0,1,0)$ and compute

$$g_{\alpha\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 1 & -\sin\varphi^5 \sin\varphi^6 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -\cos\varphi^5 \sin\varphi^4 \sin\varphi^{46} & \cos^2\varphi^4 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & \cos\varphi^{46} \sin\varphi^4 \sin\varphi^5 & 0 \\ -\sin\varphi^5 \sin\varphi^6 & -\cos\varphi^5 \sin\varphi^4 \sin\varphi^{46} & \cos\varphi^{46} \sin\varphi^4 \sin\varphi^5 & Y & 0 \\ 0 & \cos^2\varphi^4 & 0 & 0 & \cos^2\varphi^4 \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^{46} &= \varphi^4 + \varphi^6, \\ Y &= \sin^2\varphi^4(\cos^2\varphi^6 + \sin^2\varphi^5) + 2\cos\varphi^4\cos\varphi^6\sin\varphi^4\sin\varphi^6 + \cos^2\varphi^4\sin^2\varphi^6. \end{aligned}$$

We also compute

$$\Pi := \int d\varphi^4 d\varphi^5 \; \mathcal{U}_6\mathcal{U}_5\mathcal{U}_4|z_0\rangle\langle z_0|\mathcal{U}_4^*\mathcal{U}_5^*\mathcal{U}_6^* = \pi^2 \mathrm{diag}(1,1,1,1,2,2) \tag{B.16}$$

and note that this commutes with $\lambda_6$.

To find explicit solutions, we choose, as for type A, $\theta^{01} = \theta^{23} = \xi$, $r = 1$ and $p = 1$ in (3.39). A solution with $\Theta \neq 0$ is then given by

$$\begin{aligned} k^{(4)} &= \left(1, -\tfrac{\sqrt{4+t_+ + t_-}}{\sqrt{3}}, 0, 0, 1, 0\right), \\ k^{(5)} &= \left(\tfrac{\sqrt{2/3}(8+2t_- + 2t_+)^{3/2}}{3} - \tfrac{5(8+2t_- + 2t_+)^{5/2}}{36\sqrt{6}} - \tfrac{2(6(8+2t_- + 2t_+))^{1/2}}{3}, \tfrac{6-4t_- + t_-^2 - 4t_+ + t_+^2}{9}, 0, 0, 0, 1\right), \\ k^{(6)} &= (0,0,0,-1,0,0), \end{aligned}$$

with

$$t_\pm = \left(\frac{29 \pm 3\sqrt{93}}{2}\right)^{1/3}.$$

As for type A, one checks that the induced and the effective metrics are constant, the effective 4-dimensional metric (3.48) has Minkowski signature, and also (B.3) is fulfilled. Of course this is just one arbitrary point of the non-trivial moduli space of solutions.

The above sets of $\lambda_\alpha$ are of course not unique. The reason for using 5 generators is that this allows to parametrize the most general perturbations around these backgrounds in terms of the $\mathcal{E}^\alpha$. This should allow to systematically study the geometric perturbations and their coupling to matter.

# C Equations of motion at the operator level

For simplicity, let us consider type A. The other types can be treated in complete analogy. As in Section 3.1, the four directions in which the compact dimensions are embedded, are specified by two complex matrices $Z^i$, with

$$Z_i = c_i e^{i n_4^i k_\mu^4 X^\mu} e^{i n_5^i k_\mu^5 X^\mu} U^{n_4^i} V^{n_5^i},$$

where $U, V$ are the fuzzy torus generators. The $c_i$ are complex numbers with $|c_1|^2 + |c_2|^2 = r^2$. We have

$$\sum_{j=4}^{7}[X^j,[X^j,Y]] = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{2}\left([Z_i,[Z_i^*,Y]] + [Z_i^*,[Z_i,Y]]\right) = 2r^2Y - \sum_{i=1}^{2}\left(Z_iYZ_i^* + Z_i^*YZ_i\right), \quad \text{(C.1)}$$

where we used that the $U, V$ are unitary. From the commutation relations

$$[X^\mu, X^\nu] = i\theta^{\mu\nu}, \qquad [X^\mu, U] = 0, \qquad [X^\mu, V] = 0, \qquad UV = qVU,$$

one immediately concludes that

$$\eta_{\lambda\rho}[X^\lambda,[X^\rho,X^\mu]] = 0, \qquad \delta_{jk}[X^j,[X^k,X^\mu]] = 0,$$

so that the equation of motion (2.5) for the non-compact directions is fulfilled. It remains to treat the remaining directions.

Let us first look at the d'Alembertian corresponding to the non-compact directions. We obtain

$$\eta_{\mu\nu}[X^\mu,[X^\nu,Z^i]] = Z^i(n_4^ik_\mu^4 + n_5^ik_\mu^5)\theta^{\mu\lambda}\eta_{\lambda\rho}\theta^{\rho\nu}(n_4^ik_\nu^4 + n_5^ik_\nu^5).$$

For the d'Alembertian corresponding to the compact directions, we find, using (C.1),

$$\sum_{l=4}^{7}[X^l,[X^l,Z^i]] = 4Z^i\sum_{j=1}^{2}|c_j|^2\sin^2\tfrac{1}{2}\left((n_4^jk_\mu^4 + n_5^jk_\mu^5)\theta^{\mu\nu}(n_4^ik_\nu^4 + n_5^ik_\nu^5) - \tfrac{2\pi}{N}(n_4^jn_5^i - n_5^jn_4^i)\right),$$

so that the equation of motion is solved if, for both $i$,

$$(n_4^ik_\mu^4 + n_5^ik_\mu^5)\theta^{\mu\lambda}\eta_{\lambda\rho}\theta^{\rho\nu}(n_4^ik_\nu^4 + n_5^ik_\nu^5) \\ + 4\sum_{j=1}^{2}|c_j|^2\sin^2\tfrac{1}{2}\left((n_4^jk_\mu^4 + n_5^jk_\mu^5)\theta^{\mu\nu}(n_4^ik_\nu^4 + n_5^ik_\nu^5) - \tfrac{2\pi}{N}(n_4^jn_5^i - n_5^jn_4^i)\right) = 0.$$

Having fixed the $n$'s and the $c$'s, we thus have two equations and 8 free parameters (two 4-vectors). Also note that after expanding the sin to the first non-trivial order, we indeed obtain the $i$th component of $\gamma^{ab}k_a^\alpha k_b^\beta\lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta$ acting on $v_0$, as

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2}|c_j|^2n_\alpha^jn_\beta^j$$

corresponds to $g_{\alpha\beta}$, cf. the r.h.s. of (3.40). Note that the expansion of the sine is not justified for the explicit solution we presented in Section B.1, as there $\Theta$, cf. (3.41), which is basically the argument of the sine, is not small. However, it is easy to construct explicit solutions with small but non-vanishing $\Theta$ by perturbing a solution with vanishing $\Theta$. Hence, the semi-classical solutions with small $\Theta$ can be related to exact solutions.

# References

[1] N. Ishibashi, H. Kawai, Y. Kitazawa, A. Tsuchiya, "A Large N reduced model as superstring," Nucl. Phys. **B498** (1997) 467-491. [hep-th/9612115].

[2] I. Chepelev, Y. Makeenko and K. Zarembo, "Properties of D-branes in matrix model of IIB superstring," Phys. Lett. B **400** (1997) 43 [hep-th/9701151].

[3] Y. Kitazawa and H. Takata, "D-brane scattering in IIB string theory and IIB matrix model," Nucl. Phys. B **551** (1999) 617 [hep-th/9810004].

[4] D. N. Kabat and W. Taylor, "Linearized supergravity from matrix theory," Phys. Lett. B **426** (1998) 297 [hep-th/9712185].

[5] H. Aoki, N. Ishibashi, S. Iso, H. Kawai, Y. Kitazawa and T. Tada, "Noncommutative Yang-Mills in IIB matrix model," Nucl. Phys. B **565** (2000) 176 [hep-th/9908141];

[6] H. Steinacker, "Emergent Geometry and Gravity from Matrix Models: an Introduction," Class. Quant. Grav. **27** (2010) 133001. [arXiv:1003.4134 [hep-th]]; H. Steinacker, "Emergent Gravity from Noncommutative Gauge Theory," JHEP **0712** (2007) 049 [arXiv:0708.2426 [hep-th]].

[7] V. O. Rivelles, "Noncommutative field theories and gravity," Phys. Lett. **B558** (2003) 191-196. [hep-th/0212262];

[8] H. S. Yang, "On The Correspondence Between Noncommuative Field Theory And Gravity," Mod. Phys. Lett. A **22** (2007) 1119 [hep-th/0612231].

[9] H. Steinacker, "On the Newtonian limit of emergent NC gravity and long-distance corrections," JHEP **0912** (2009) 024 [arXiv:0909.4621 [hep-th]].

[10] H. Steinacker, "Gravity and compactified branes in matrix models," arXiv:1202.6306 [hep-th].

[11] H. Steinacker, "The curvature of branes, currents and gravity in matrix models," arXiv:1210.8364 [hep-th].

[12] H. Steinacker, "Split noncommutativity and compactified brane solutions in matrix models," Prog. Theor. Phys. **126** (2012) 613 [arXiv:1106.6153 [hep-th]].

[13] D. Bak and K. -M. Lee, "Noncommutative supersymmetric tubes," Phys. Lett. B **509** (2001) 168 [hep-th/0103148]; P. G. Shepard, "Bloch waves and fuzzy cylinders: 1/4-BPS solutions of matrix theory," JHEP **0602** (2006) 003; [hep-th/0510127]. S. Terashima, "Supertubes in matrix model and DBI action," JHEP **0703** (2007) 075 [hep-th/0701179]

[14] J. Hoppe, "Some classical solutions of membrane matrix model equations," In *Cargese 1997, Strings, branes and dualities* 423-427 [hep-th/9702169];

[15] A. Connes, M. R. Douglas and A. S. Schwarz, "Noncommutative geometry and matrix theory: Compactification on tori," JHEP **9802** (1998) 003 [hep-th/9711162]; A. Chatzistavrakidis and L. Jonke, "Matrix theory compactifications on twisted tori," Phys. Rev. D **85** (2012) 106013 [arXiv:1202.4310 [hep-th]].

[16] H. Aoki, “Chiral fermions and the standard model from the matrix model compactified on a torus,” Prog. Theor. Phys. **125** (2011) 521 [arXiv:1011.1015 [hep-th]].

[17] H. Steinacker, “Emergent Gravity and Noncommutative Branes from Yang-Mills Matrix Models,” Nucl. Phys. **B810** (2009) 1-39. [arXiv:0806.2032 [hep-th]]

[18] J. Arnlind, J. Choe, J. Hoppe, “Noncommutative Minimal Surfaces”. arXiv:1301.0757 [math.QA]

[19] J. J. Sylvester, Johns Hopkins University Circulars I (1882) 241-242 ; ibid II (1883) 46; ibid III (1884) 7-9. Summarized in The Collected Mathematics Papers of James Joseph Sylvester (Cambridge University Press, 1909).

[20] A. Chatzistavrakidis, H. Steinacker and G. Zoupanos, “Intersecting branes and a standard model realization in matrix models,” JHEP **1109** (2011) 115 [arXiv:1107.0265 [hep-th]].

[21] A. Chatzistavrakidis, H. Steinacker and G. Zoupanos, “On the fermion spectrum of spontaneously generated fuzzy extra dimensions with fluxes,” Fortsch. Phys. **58** (2010) 537 [arXiv:0909.5559 [hep-th]].

[22] J. Zahn, “Action and locality principle for noncommutative scalar field theories,” (in German), Diploma thesis, Universität Hamburg, DESY-THESIS-2003-041.

[23] J. Nishimura and A. Tsuchiya, “Local field theory from the expanding universe at late times in the IIB matrix model,” arXiv:1208.4910 [hep-th].

[24] D. Klammer and H. Steinacker, “Cosmological solutions of emergent noncommutative gravity,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **102** (2009) 221301 [arXiv:0903.0986 [gr-qc]].

[25] R. M. Wald, “General Relativity,” Chicago, Usa: Univ. Pr. ( 1984) 491p